arXiv:1408.1463v1 [math.DS] 7 Aug 2014

REVERSIBILITY OF ADDITIVE CA AS FUNCTION OF CYLINDER SIZE

VALERIY BULITKO

ATHABASCA UNIVERSITY
VALERIYB@ATHABASCAU.CA

ABSTRACT. Additive CA on a cylinder of size n can be represented by 01-string V of length n which is its rule. We study a problem: a class S of rules given, for any $V \in S$ describe all sizes $n', n' > n$, of cylinders such that extension of V by zeros to length n' represents reversible additive CA on a cylinder of size n'. Since all extensions of V have the same collection of positions of units, it is convenient to say about classes of collections of positions instead of classes of rules. A criterion of reversibility is proven. The problem is completely solved for infinite class of "block collections", i.e. $\{(0, 1, \ldots, h)|h \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$. Results obtained for "exponential collections" $\{(1, 2, 4, \ldots, 2^h)|h \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ essentially reduce the complexity of the problem for this class. Ways to transfer the results on other classes of rules/collections are described. A conjecture is formulated for class $\{(0, 1, 2^m)|m \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$.

MSC-class: 37B15, 68Q80
Keywords: 1-dimensional additive CA, reversibility, cylinder size

The problem of reversibility of general cellular automata comes from a general theory of computations as well as from applications. In algorithmic formulation the problem was shown to be undecidable for dimensions higher 1 and decidable in dimension 1. There are more subtle aspects of those results relating to complexity (descriptive and algorithmic). See an overview and some references in

`http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reversible\_cellular\_automaton`

On the other hand consideration of semi-groups of automata also leads to reversibility problems of a certain kind. In particular, if we deal with additive CA on a cylinder of size n it is possible to represent automata rules and states by elements of a semi-group built on strings of length n with a discrete convolution as an operation. From this prospect reversible automata create a subgroup of the semi-group. If we want to general features of the groups of reversible additive CA on cylinders we might want to find a way for any size n of a cylinder to construct reversible strings that could constitute a set of generators of the group for the cylinder.

Let $\mathfrak{M}_n$ be the set of all 01-strings of length n. For any $V, W \in \mathfrak{M}_n$ we denote j-th component of V by $V(j), 0 \leq j < n$, and denote convolution of V, W as $V \boxtimes W$ where $[V \boxtimes W](j) = \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} V(s)W(j-s) \pmod 2$. $\mathfrak{S}_n$ is a semi-group on $\mathfrak{M}_n$ created by operation $\boxtimes$. Let $\mathfrak{G}_n$ be a sub-group of $\mathfrak{S}_n$ of all reversible elements.

In a slightly more general form the problem might be formulated as following: a subset S of $\mathbb{Z}^+$ and a function $f : S \to \mathfrak{M}_n$ given, describe $\{n \in S|f(n) \in \mathfrak{G}_n\}$. Although in this paper we consider probably the simplest couples (S, f). Namely let $V \in \mathfrak{M}_n$. We define S_V, f_V as following: $S_V = \{n' \in \mathbb{Z}^+|n' > n\}$, $f_V(n')$ is a string that has length n' and s.t. V is its prefix whereas all positions $i, n \leq i < n'$, are occupied with 0. In other words we consider all extensions of V with zeros and search for which lengths the extensions are reversible. For example, if $V = (1, 1, 0, 0, 1)$ the question is: for which $n, n > 5$, the string $(1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, \ldots, 0)$ of length n is reversible on a cylinder of size n.

A string W given its j-th position is denoted as $W(j)$. In case when a string is represented by a complex expression like $V \boxtimes W$ for instance, j-th position will be denoted as $[V \boxtimes W](j)$. Expression $[W]_a^b$ is applicable to string W of length n when $0 \le a \le b \le n$ and denotes the sub-string of W that begins with position a and ends with position b. So, $[W]_j^j = W(j)$. If denotation W is a simple we sometime use $W\ |_a^b$ instead of $[W]_a^b$. Sometimes it is convenient to write a string $(i_1, \dots, i_k), i_j \in A$, as a word in alphabet A. For example, string $(0, 1, 1, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ of length 15 could be represented by word $01^3 0^{11}$. σ^j denotes a cyclic shift to right; namely

$$[\sigma^j(V)](i) = V((i-j) \pmod n).$$

For any length $\mathbf{0}$ denotes a zero string $(0, \dots, 0)$.

Relative positions of units in a string and a cylinder size determine reversibility of the string. Let $V[x_1, \dots, x_r;\, n]$ is a string of length n with $r, r \ge 1$, units such that $x_i, i = 1, \dots, r$, are positions of units in the string where $0 \le x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_r \le n$.

Given a string $V[x_1, \dots, x_r;\, n]$ let ∂V denote a derivative string $V[x_2 - x_1, \dots, x_r - x_1; n]$. In case $r \le 1$ we assume $\partial V = \mathbf{0}$.

Lemma 1. *$V[x_1, \dots, x_r;\, n]$ given, the following equivalences hold*

$$V \boxtimes L = \mathbf{0} \iff (\partial V) \boxtimes L = L \iff L = \sum_{i=2}^{r} \sigma^{x_i - x_1}(L) \pmod 2,$$

where L is non-zero string of length n.

Proof. First

$$[V \boxtimes L](j) = \sum_{s=1}^{n} V(s) L(j-s) = \sum_{s: V(s)=1} L(j-s) = \sum_i L(j - x_i) = 0. \tag{1}$$

The latter equation can be represented as

$$L(j - x_1) + \sum_{i=2}^{r} L((j - x_1) - (x_i - x_1)) = 0, j = 0, \dots, n-1.$$

Since x_1 is fixed, by modulo n the amount $j - x_1$ runs over the whole set $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$. Therefore the latter equation could be rewritten as

$$L(j) = \sum_{i=2}^{r} L(j - (x_i - x_1)), j = 0, \dots, n-1. \tag{2}$$

Now, as $L(j-a) = [\sigma^a(L)](j)$, the latter system of equations could be rewritten as

$$L = \sum_{i=2}^{r} \sigma^{x_i - x_1}(L) \pmod 2.$$

On the other hand,

$$[(\partial V) \boxtimes L](j) = \sum_s [\partial V](s) L(j-s)$$

and taking into account that $[\partial V](s) = 1$ iff $s = x_i - x_1$ for some $i \in \{2, \dots, r\}$ we get that for all j it holds

$$[(\partial V) \boxtimes L](j) = \sum_s [\partial V](s) L(j-s) = \sum_{i=2}^{r} L(j - (x_i - x_1)) \pmod 2.$$

From (2) it follows

$$(\partial V) \boxtimes L = L.$$

□

Lemma 2. *Let $x_l \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}, l = \overline{1, r},\ l < l' \implies x_i < x_{l'}$. Then $V[x_1, \dots, x_r; n]$ is irreversible on a cylinder of size n iff a non-zero string L of length n exists satisfying the condition*

$$L(j) = \sum_{i=2}^{r} L(j - (x_i - x_1)), j = 0, \dots, n-1.$$

Proof. As $V \boxtimes (T + L) = (V \boxtimes T) + (V \boxtimes L)$[1], it holds that $V[x_1, \dots, x_r; n]$ is irreversible on a cylinder of size n iff there exists a non-zero string L of the length n such that $V \boxtimes L = \mathbf{0}$. As it is shown by (1), (2) in the proof above

$$[V \boxtimes L](j) = 0 \iff L(j) = \sum_{i=2}^{r} L(j - (x_i - x_1)) \pmod 2$$

for all $j = 0, \dots, n-1$.

We could start with another form of irreversibility of V. It is an existence of a linear combination of $\sigma^i(V)$ (where σ^j is shift to right on j positions by modulo n) of $V[x_1, \dots, x_r; n]$ that is equal to zero. We can represent the combination by a non-zero vector L of length n where units show the lines of a circulant $\mathcal{C}(V)$ for $V[x_1, \dots, x_r; n]$ occurring in the combination:

$$\sum_{L(j) \neq 0} \sigma^j(V[x_1, \dots, x_r; n]) = (0, \dots, 0) \pmod 2.$$

Let

$$[K[x]](i) = \begin{cases} 1, & i = x, \\ 0, & i \neq x. \end{cases}$$

With this denotation it is possible to rewrite the LHS as

$$\sum_{L(j) \neq 0} \sigma^j \left(\sum_{l=1}^{r} K[x_l] \right) = \sum_{L(j) \neq 0} \sum_{l=1}^{r} \sigma^j(K[x_l]) = \sum_{l=1}^{r} \left[\sum_{L(j) \neq 0} \sigma^j(K[x_l]) \right]$$

[1]All sums are done by modulo 2.

On the other hand $\sum_{L(j)\neq 0}\sigma^j(K[x]) = \sigma^x(L)$. Indeed, $\left[\sum_{L(j)\neq 0}\sigma^j(K[x])\right](i) = 1 \iff \exists j[L(j)=1 \,\&\, x+j=i] \iff [\sigma^x(L)](i)=1$. Therefore

$$\sum_{L(j)\neq 0}\sigma^j\left(\sum_{l=1}^{r}K[x_l]\right)=\sum_{l=1}^{r}\sigma^{x_l}(L)$$

Thus

$$\sum_{L(j)\neq 0}\sigma^j(V[x_1,\dots,x_r;n]) = (0,\dots,0)\,(\mathrm{mod}\ 2) \iff \sum_{l=1}^{r}\sigma^{x_l}(L) = [0,\dots,0]\,(\mathrm{mod}\ 2).$$

Hence for each $j \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}$ we have $\sum_{l=1}^{r}\sigma^{x_l}(L)|_j^j = 0\,(\mathrm{mod}\ 2)$. Since $\sigma^a(T)|_b^b = T(b-a)$, we arrive at

$$\sum_{l=1}^{r}L(j-x_l)=0\,(\mathrm{mod}\ 2),\ j=0,\dots,n-1.$$

This is the last equality from (1). $\square$

Lemma 3. *If $r, x_1,\dots,x_r$ are arbitrary non-negative integers s.t. $r>1, x_1<x_2<\dots<x_r$ and ω is any $(0,1)$-string of length $\delta, \delta = x_r - x_1$, then there exists a unique unlimited from the right end $(0,1)$-string T satisfying the recursion*

$$\begin{cases}\forall i<\delta \quad [T(i)=\omega(i)],\\ \forall i\geq\delta \quad [T(i)=\sum_{l=2}^{r}T(i-(x_l-x_1))].\end{cases} \tag{3}$$

The solution T is periodic after a pre-period. For the lengths λ_{pp}, λ_p of the pre-period and period respectively, $\lambda_{pp}+\lambda_p \leq |2|^\delta - 1$.

Proof. ω given, T is defined by the recursion uniquely. If ω is zero-string, obviously T is also zero-string with period of length 1 and empty pre-period. Let ω be non-zero. From the recursion 3 it follows that apart from the prefix ω each sub-string (sub-word) of T of length δ depends only on the previous sub-string of length δ. When sub-strings $T|_t^{t+\delta-1}$ and $T|_{t+k}^{t+k+\delta-1}$ coincide, the sub-string $T|_t^{t+k-1}$ appears to be a period of string $T|_t^\infty$. That is the solution should be periodical starting from some point t. Since there could be no more than $|2|^\delta$ the sum of lengths of the pre-period and period do not exceed $|2|^\delta - 1$. $\square$

Corollary 1. *The recursion (3) has a solution T for some string ω iff (3) has purely periodic solution T' with the same period.*

Proof. Indeed, if T is a solution unlimited from right with a prefix ω then for any integer t the string $T' = T|_t$ also is a solution to the recursion but maybe with another prefix ω' where $\omega' = T_t^{t+\delta}$. $\square$

Examples $(x_1,x_2,x_3) \in \{(1,2,4),(1,3,4),(1,4,5),(1,2,5),(1,4,8),(1,3,12),(1,2,16),(1,8,16)\}$ (see Table 1 below, lines 3,4,8,10,11,12,15,21) show that the upper bound $|2|^\delta - 1$ for λ_p is reachable.

An odd r and positions $x_1, \dots, x_r$ given, the point of interest is the spectrum of all lengths of periods of non-zero solutions to (3) for possible ω because the knowledge allows to conclude about reversibility of $V[x_1, \dots, x_r; n]$. From this angle of view it makes a sense to introduce the following terms. We call *collection of positions* any not empty finite sequence (in increasing order) of non-negative integers. If $C = (x_1, \dots, x_r)$ is a collection of positions we call collection of *shifts* for C the derivative collection ∂C that is $(r-1)$-tuple $(x_2 - x_1, \dots, x_r - x_1)$. So, elements of ∂C are shifts. Note that the recursion (3) is defined in terms of the derivative collections, i.e. in terms of shifts.

Theorem 1. *A collection $C = (x_1, \dots, x_r)$ of positions given:*

(i) *the string $V[x_1, \dots, x_r; n]$ is irreversible*[2] *iff n is multiple of the length of a period of a possible solution to the recursion (3);*
(ii) *If $V[x_1, \dots, x_r; n]$ is irreversible, n is multiple of a number not exceeding $2^{x_r - x_1} - 1$;*
(iii) *when $r = 1$ the string $V[x_1; n]$ is reversible for any $n > x_1$;*
(iv) *if r is even, $V[x_1, \dots, x_r; n]$ is irreversible for any $n, n > x_r$.*

Proof. If $V[x_1, \dots, x_r; n]$ is irreversible on a cylinder of size n then by lemma 2 there exist a vector L of length n satisfying the condition

$$L(i) = L(i - (x_2 - x_1)) + \dots + L(i - (x_r - x_1)), i = 0, \dots, n-1, \pmod 2. \tag{4}$$

This is the second relation of the recursion (3). To satisfy the first we set $\omega = L|_0^{x_r - x_1}$. In this case the pre-period is empty and the length of the period divides n.

Conversely, if recursion (3) is true for a string L and its period divides n we can replace L with purely periodic solution L' having the same period length, corollary 1. As for L' the relation

$$L'(i) = L'(i - (x_2 - x_1)) + \dots + L'(i - (x_r - x_1)), i = 0, \dots, n-1, \pmod 2,$$

is satisfied, lemma 2 is applicable.

The case $r = 1$ is obvious because by a cyclic shift $V[x_1; n]$ is transformable into $\mathbf{1}$ for cylinder of size n. When r is even one might set $L = \mathbf{1}$ on the cylinder of size n. Note, that if $r = 0$ then $V = \mathbf{0}$. $\square$

A 01-string with finite number of units defines a collection C of positions $(x_1, \dots, x_r)$. Its derivative collection of shifts determines a series S of periods which we call *spectrum* of both C and ∂C. As we saw, any spectrum consists of numbers multiple of a finite set of numbers that are lesser $(x_r - x_1)(2^{x_r - x_1} + 1)$ (see theorem 1, (ii)). On the other hand, in fact only a maximal sub-system $K(S)$ elements of a spectrum S s.t. $\forall x \in S \forall y \in K(S)[x \neq y \implies x \nmid y]$ is essential. For example, for $S = \{k\pi | \pi \in \{42, 21, 14, 7, 3\}, k \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ the sub-system is $[7, 3]$. Let us call $K(S)$ the *spectrum kernel*. The definition $K(S) = \{y \in S | \forall x \in S[x \neq y \to x \nmid y]\}$ is correct since define the set uniquely. Namely $K(S)$ is the set of all minimal elements in partial order $x \preceq y$ defined as $x \mid y$ on the set of period lengths.

[2]Naturally on a cylinder of size n.

TABLE 1. Some examples of collections of positions and lengths of the corresponding proper periods.

#	collections	lengths of proper periods	#	collections	lengths of proper periods
1	1, 2, 3	3	13	1, 3, 10	365, 31, 15
2	2, 3, 4	3	14	1, 3, 11	42, 14, 21, 7, 6, 3
3	1, 3, 4	7	15	1, 3, 12	2047
4	1, 2, 4	7	16	1, 3, 13	126, 63
5	3, 4, 5	3	17	1, 3, 14	1785, 255, 21, 7, 3
6	2, 4, 5	7	18	1, 3, 15	254, 127
7	2, 3, 5	7	19	1, 3, 16	4599, 511, 63
8	1, 4, 5	15	20	1, 4, 16	63, 21, 9, 7
9	1, 3, 5	6, 3	21	1, 8, 16	32767
10	1, 2, 5	15	22	2, 5, 7, 8, 9	42, 21, 7, 6, 3
11	1, 4, 8	127	23	2, 4, 6, 7, 9	105, 15, 7
12	1, 2, 16	32767	24	1, 6, 7, 8, 9	217,31,7

We call *block-collection* a collection of positions of kind $(a, a+1, \ldots, a+h)$ where a, h are some non-negative integers.

Theorem 2. *For any block-collection $C = (0, 1, \ldots, h), h \in \mathbb{N}, h > 0$, the lengths of proper periods are exactly all divisors of $h+1$ apart from 1 if $h+1$ is odd and apart from periods of length 2 if $2|h \wedge 4 \nmid h$. In case of period length 1 when h is even we necessarily deal with zero-solution.*

Proof. Let L be a string satisfying the recursion with the collection $(0, 1, \ldots, h)$ of positions. Let us for sake of convenience the enumeration of positions of symbols in L start with 1. We show now that $L(h+1) = \rho(L_1^h)$ (where $\rho(X)$ is the parity of a string X) and $L|_{h+2}^{2h+1} = L_1^h$.

Indeed, $L(h+1) = \sum_{k=1}^{h} L(k)$ due to the fact that $\partial C = (1, \ldots, h)$. And obviously $\rho(L_1^h) = \sum_{k=1}^{h} L(k)$.[3] From here for $L(h+2)$ we have equation

$$L(h+2) = L(h+1) + \sum_{k=2}^{h} L(k) =$$

$$L(h+1) + \rho(L|_1^h) + L(1) = \rho(L|_1^h) + \rho(L|_1^h) + L(1) = L(1).$$

Hence $L(h+2) = L(1)$. Assume it has been already deduced that

$$1 < j < h \implies L(h+j) = L(j-1). \tag{5}$$

From here again by direct observation of the given recursion relation for $L(h+j+1)$ we obtain:

$$L(h+(j+1)) = \sum_{k=j+1}^{h} L(k) + \rho(L_1^h) + \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} L(k) = \left(\sum_{k=1}^{j-1} L(k) + \sum_{k=j+1}^{h} L(k)\right) + \rho(L_1^h) =$$

$$\big(\rho(L_1^h) + L(j)\big) + \rho(L_1^h) = L(j).$$

[3]Reminder: all sums should be calculated by modulo 2.

For $L(2h+1)$ we have recursion equation

$$L(2h+1) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} L(h+k) = \rho(L_1^h) + \sum_{k=2}^{h} L(h+k) = \rho(L_1^h) + \sum_{k=2}^{h} L(k-1) = \rho(L_1^h) + \sum_{k=1}^{h-1} L(k) = \rho(L_1^h) + \big(\rho(L_1^h) + L(h)\big) = L(h).$$

Thus the sequence $L(1), \dots, L(h), \rho(L_1^h)$ repeats for any $L|_1^h$. Hence, no proper period exists with length exceeding $h+1$.

Now, let $h > 1$. Obviously we can choose $L|_1^h$ so that $L|_1^h, \rho(L_1^h)$ became non-periodic and thereby realize a period of length $h+1$. For that (for instance) set $L(i) = 0, 1 \le i < h, L(h) = 1$. In this case $\rho(L_1^h) = 1$ and period looks like $0 \dots 011$.[4] If $h = 1$ the only periods are 0 and 1 of length 1.

Let $h > 1$ and is even. For any proper positive divisor m of $h+1$ (i.e. $m < h+1$) we can construct a period π of length q where $q = \frac{h+1}{m}$. Indeed, $q \ge 3$ and is odd (as well as m because of $h+1$ is odd). And we define $\pi = 1^{q-1}0$. Since $q-1$ is even, $\sum_{k=1}^{h} L(k) = 0$ when $L|_1^{h+1}$ is compiled from π as π^m. In this construction $L(h+1)$ appears to be the last symbol of the last occurrence of π in $L|_1^{h+1}$ and therefore is equal to $\rho(L|_1^h)$ as necessary (see above). Since π is aperiodic, no lesser period exists for this definition of L.

If $m = h+1$ we have $q = 1$. The only possible solution for L must consist of zeros: otherwise L can consist only of ones but this is inconsistent with $\rho(L_1^h) = 0$ (because h is even).

Finally, let $h > 1$ and is odd. In this case obviously there exist both trivial solutions when L is built only from zeros or only from ones. The period is 1 in these cases. When m is a proper divisor of $h+1$ (i.e. $1 < q < h+1$) we have the above construction applicable as well if $q > 2$. It is also applicable when $q = 2 \wedge 4 \mid h+1$. Indeed, we have even m for this case we set $L|_1^h = (10)^{m-1}1$ getting $\rho(L|_1^h) = 0$ due to the fact that $(m-1)$ is odd. Hence $L|_1^{h+1} = (10)^m$ and 01 is a period.

For the case $q = 2 \wedge 4 \nmid h+1$ no period of length 2 is possible: in this case $q = 2, m$ is odd and we have two opportunities to try. The first $L|_1^h = (10)^{m-1}1$ yields $\rho(L|_1^h) = 1$ because $m-1$ is odd and period 10 is destructed by $L(h+1) = 1$. The second $L|_1^h = (01)^{m-1}0$ yields $\rho(L|_1^h) = 0$, i.e. a sub-string 00 in L that contradicts to the form of the period. [5] $\square$

Let C be a collection $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_r$ of positions, m a positive integer, and W be a string of length $g \ge \delta$ where $\delta = x_r - x_1$. We denote $C[m]\{W\}$ a string T of length $\delta + m$ obtained by recursion 3

$$\forall i \in \{0, \dots, g+m\} \begin{cases} 0 \le i < g \implies T(i) = W(i), \\ g \le i \implies T(i) = \sum_{l=2}^{r} T(i - (x_l - x_1)). \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

[4] Of course there could be many other settings.

[5] We can directly set $L(0) = 0$ and $L(i) = 1, i = \overline{1, 2h}$ for the maximal length of the period. Another definition for the maximal period is $L(2h-1) = L(2h) = 1, L(i) = 0, i = \overline{0, 2h-2}$.

We write $C\{W\}$ in case $m=1$. And $C^a\{W\} = \underbrace{C\{C\{\dots C\{W\}\dots\}\}}_{a \text{ times}}$. Clearly $C[m]\{W\} = C^m\{W\}$. We define also that $C[0]\{W\} = C^0\{W\} = W$.

Theorem 3. $C[m]\{W+V\} = C[m]\{W\} + C[m]\{V\}$.

Proof. First we have $[C[m]\{W+V\}]|_0^{g-1} = [W+V]|_0^{g-1} = W|_0^{g-1} + V|_0^{g-1} = [C[m]\{W\}]|_0^{g-1} + [C[m]\{V\}]|_0^{g-1}$. Assume that $g \le i \le m+g$ and for for all $j < i$ the equality

$$[C[m]\{W+V\}](j) = [C[m]\{W\}](j) + [C[m]\{V\}](j)$$

is proven. Let $T = C[m]\{W\}$ and $H = C[m]\{V\}$. From (6) we have

$$[C[m]\{W+V\}](i) = \sum_{l=2}^{r}[C[m]\{W+V\}](i-(x_l-x_1)) =_{\text{by induction hypothesis}}$$

$$\sum_{l=2}^{r}[C[m]\{W\}+C[m]\{V\}](i-(x_l-x_1)) =$$

$$\sum_{l=2}^{r}[C[m]\{W\}](i-(x_l-x_1)) + \sum_{l=2}^{r}[C[m]\{V\}](i-(x_l-x_1)) = T(i)+H(i).$$

□

Proposition 1. *Let T, H are periodic strings on the same segment I with lengths of periods t, h respectively and the length of I is multiple of $\mathrm{lcm}(t,h)$. Then $T+H$ has a period on I whose length divides $\mathrm{lcm}(t,h)$.*

Proof. Obviously $\mathrm{lcm}(t,h)$ is a period for $T+H$. □

Proposition 2. *Let $x, y, x \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$. The equation $2^x = 2^y + 2^z$ has unique solutions $x = z+1, y = z$.*

Proof. Sure, $x = y+z, y = z$ is a solution to $2^x = 2^y + 2^z$. Assume $y > z$. In this case $2^x > 2^y$ and therefore $2^{x-1} \ge 2^y \ \wedge\ 2^{x-1} > 2^z$. Hence $2^x = 2^{x-1} + 2^{x-1} > 2^y + 2^z$. □

Let $\mathcal{E}_n = (1, 2, 4, \dots, 2^n)$, i.e. i-th shift is $s_i = 2^i, i = \overline{1,n}$, and $K_{m,n} = 0^{m-1}10^{n-m}$. It is worth to note that the action of operator $C[m]$ on a string W as it is defined depends only on ∂C in fact. Therefore $\mathcal{E}_n$ as operator is defined completely by shift collection $\partial\mathcal{E}_n$ whose elements we denote below as $s_i, s_i = 2^i - 1, i = 1, \dots, n$. We call collections $\mathcal{E}_n$ *exponential collections* of positions.

Theorem 3 reduces behaviour of operators on strings to their behaviour on constituents $K_{m,n}$.

Lemma 4. *The following holds*[6]

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{E}_n^{2^{n+1}-1}\{K_{m,2^n-1}\} = \\ K_{m,2^n-1} \cdot K_{\eta,\eta} \cdot \Pi_{j=k}^{n}\left[\left(\Pi_{i=0}^{k-2}K_{1,2^i}\right) \cdot K_{1,2^j-2^{k-1}+1-m\,\delta_{n,j}}\right] \cdot K_{m,2^n-1} \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

[6]For convenience we assume supports of strings to start with number 1.

where "$\cdot$" means concatenation of words, $k = \mu z[s_z \geq 2^n - m], \eta = m - (2^n - 2^k)$ and $\delta_{a,b}$ is Kronecker delta. In case $k = 1$ we use the agreement that $\Pi_{i=a}^{b} W_i$ is the empty word when $b < a$.

Proof. For a proof see Addendum 1 below. □

Corollary 2. *The length of any the proper period of $\mathcal{E}_n$ on any constituent $K_{m,2^n-1}$ is exactly $2^n - 1$.*

Proof. As it was shown in the previous lemma, the strings $\mathcal{E}_n^{2^{n+1}-1}\{K_{m,2^n-1}\}$ are not periodic. Also the $\mathcal{E}_n^{2^{n+1}-1}\{K_{m,2^n-1}\}$of length $2^n - 1$ of the string $\mathcal{E}_n^{2^{n+1}-1}\{K_{m,2^n-1}\}$ coincides with □

Thus the following holds:

Theorem 4. *For any collection $\mathcal{E}_n$ each element of its spectrum kernel is a divisor of $2^{n+1} - 1$.*

This result greatly reduce the upper bound of numbers that lengths of periods for the collections should be multiple of. Indeed, from theorem 1 we get the upper bound $2^{2^n-1} - 1$ for lengths of proper periods dealing with collection $\mathcal{E}_n$. Now it is reduced to $2^{n+1} - 1$.

It follows from theorem 1 in cases of odd n collections $\mathcal{E}_n$ have periods of all lengths.[7] Here we present lists of lengths of proper periods for an initial segment of even values of n.

TABLE 2. All lengths of proper periods for $\mathcal{E}_n$ where $n \leq 12$ and is even.

n	shifts	lengths of proper periods
2	1, 2, 4	7
4	1, 2, 4, 8, 16	31
6	1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64	127
8	1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256	511, 73, 7
10	1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256, 512, 1024	2047, 89, 23
12	1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256, 512, 1024, 2048, 4096	8191

Some different collections of shifts might be equivalent in a sense that the strings defined by them have the same periods.

Theorem 5. *For any positive integer a the collections $C = (x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ and $C + a = (x_1 + a, \ldots, x_r + a)$ have the same periods.*

Proof. This directly follows from two facts. First, the recursion defined by a collection C depends only on elements of $\partial(C)$. And second, $\partial(C) = \partial(C + a)$. □

Another connection between different collections of positions is described by the next result.

Let $\eta(n, m)$ is the maximal divisor of n s.t. all prime divisors of $\eta(n, m)$ divide m. For instance, $\eta(150, 20) = 50 = 2 \cdot 5 \cdot 5$ because $2, 5$ are only primes dividing 20. From the definition it follows that $\eta(n, m) \mid n$ and $\gcd(n, m) = 1 \implies \eta(n, m) = 1$.

[7]Though lists of proper period lengths is finite. For instance, for $n = 3$ the position collection is $(1, 2, 4, 8)$. Its proper period lengths are 1,3,15.

Theorem 6. *Let $C = (x_1, \dots, x_r)$ is a position collection, B is its spectrum kernel, and $a \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Position collection $aC = (ax_1, \dots, ax_r)$ has spectrum kernel $\{b\eta(a, b)|b \in B\}$.*

Proof. See Addendum 2 below. □

Theorem 7. *Collections $C = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{r-1}, x_r)$ and $C^R = (a - x_r, a - x_{r-1}, \dots, a - x_1)$ where $a = x_1 + x_r$ have the same list of length of periods and thereby the same kernel.*

Proof. One proof is based on symmetry "left-right". Indeed, we can define recursion in the direction from right to left using the equation in a form

$$\begin{cases} L(i + x_1 - x_r) = L(i + x_1 - x_{r-1}) + \dots \\ +L(i + x_1 - x_2) + L(i + x_1 - x_1), i = 0, \dots, n - 1, \pmod 2. \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

This means that if two side infinite string L satisfying the recursion defined by collection $C = (x_1, \dots, x_r)$ satisfies also the recursion 8 defined by C^R in the direction from right to left. Hence the reflection L^R satisfies the recursion defined by the collection C^R but already in the standard direction from left to right. Since all possible periods for strings L^R are reversions of possible periods of strings L and vice versa, the lengths of periods for C and C^R are the same. From here kernels are the same. □

Example 1. Collections $(1, 5, 8, 9, 11), (1, 3, 4, 7, 11)$ have the same list of proper periods lengths: $3, 7, 21, 31, 93, 217, 651$ because $(1, 5, 8, 9, 11)^R = (1, 3, 4, 7, 11)$. □

We can introduce a characteristic of reversibility for a collection $C = (x_1, \dots, x_r)$ of shifts as a number $\mathfrak{s} = \frac{1}{1+|\mathcal{P}|}$ where $\mathcal{P}$ is the maximal (w.r.t. power) set of relatively prime lengths of periods of the collection. We call this number *reversibility index*. The collections with index 1 contain one shift only, i.e. look like $C = (x_1)$, because $\mathcal{P} = \emptyset$ for them. All other has stability lesser 1. The collections $C = (x_1, \dots, x_r)$ with even r has zero reversibility index because any prime number is their period. However for odd r collections have finite $|\mathcal{P}|$. Hence only collections of even powers have zero index.

Theorem 8. *For any integer m there exist infinitely many collections $C = (x_1, \dots, x_r)$ (even with pairwise different $\partial(C)$ if $m > 1$) whose reversibility index is equal to $\frac{1}{m}$.*

Proof. m given consider collection $C = (0, 1, 2, \dots, a(m) - 1)$ where $a(m) = \Pi_{i=1}^{m-1} p_i$ and $\{p_1, \dots, p_{m-1}\}$ is any set of prime numbers s.t. $2 < p_1 < p_2 < \dots p_{m-1}$. The number $a(m)$ is odd and $a(m) - 1$ is even. On the other side if S is a finite set of primes and set $\overline{S}$ is constructed from all products of primes from S, then the power of any system of elements of $\overline{S}$ which are relatively prime pairwise does not exceed $|S|$.[8] Hence $|\mathcal{P}| = m - 1$ according to theorem 2. Therefore the reversibility index for C is $\frac{1}{m}$. Since there exist infinitely many different pairwise sets of $m - 1$ primes satisfying the conditions above, the statement is proven. □

[8]The power of any system of subsets of S that are pairwise disjoint and non empty does not exceed $|S|$.

Theorem 1 gives an upper limit $2^{x_r - x_1} - 1$ for lengths of proper periods a collection $C = (x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ might have. As we saw (theorem 2) for block-collection $(x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ the upper limit is $x_r - x_1 + 1$. And for exponential collections it is $2x_r - x_1$, theorem 4. We *conjecture* that for collections (x_1, x_2, x_3) where $x_2 = x_1 + 1, x_3 = x_1 + 2^m, m > 0$, the upper limit for proper cycle lengths is $(x_3 - x_1)^2 - 1$.

ADDENDUM 1: A PROOF OF THE LEMMA 4

Lemma 4. *The following holds*[9]

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{E}_n^{2^{n+1}-1}\{K_{m,2^n-1}\} = \\ K_{m,2^n-1}\cdot K_{\eta,\eta}\cdot \Pi_{j=k}^{n}\left[\left(\Pi_{i=0}^{k-2}K_{1,2^i}\right)\cdot K_{1,2^j-2^{k-1}+1-m\,\delta_{n,j}}\right]\cdot K_{m,2^n-1} \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

where "$\cdot$" means concatenation of words, $k=\mu z[s_z\geq 2^n-m]$, $\eta=m-(2^n-2^k)$ and $\delta_{a,b}$ is Kronecker delta. In case $k=1$ we use the agreement that $\Pi_{i=a}^{b}W_i$ is the empty word when $b<a$.

Proof. For $n\leq 3$ the lemma can be checked directly:
For $n=2,k=2$ we deal with case $k=n$. When $m=1$ the result is 1001110100; when $m=2$ we have the resulting word 0100111010.
For $n=3,m=5$ the result is $0^4 10^2 1110^2 110^5 10^2$
For $n=3,m=6$ the result is $0^5 10^2 1110^2 110^5 10$.

Obviously $1\leq m<2^n,\ 1\leq k\leq n$. Then by the definition of k we have $2^n-s_i\leq m \iff k\leq i$. From here $m>2^n-2^k$. Therefore $\eta\geq 1$ and $j\geq k \implies 2^j-2^{k-1}+1-m\,\delta_{n,j}\geq 1$. The latter follows from $k>i \implies m\leq 2^n-2^i$ which in its turn is a consequence of the equivalence $2^n-s_i\leq m \iff k\leq i$ above. So, $m\leq 2^n-2^{k-1}$.[10]

The formula from the condition simplifies in cases $k\in\{1,2,n\}$. If $k=1$ then $m=2^n-1$; $k=2$ implies $m\in\{2^n-3,2^n-2\}$; and when $k=n$ we have $m\leq 2^{n-1}$. The simplified[11] values of $\mathcal{E}_n^{2^{n+1}-1}\{K_{m,2^n-1}\}$ are the following

$$K_{2^n-1,2^n-1}\cdot 1\cdot\left[\Pi_{j=1}^{n-1}K_{1,2^j}\right]\cdot 1\cdot K_{2^n-1,2^n-1},\quad k=1, \tag{10}$$

$$K_{m,2^n-1}\cdot K_{m,m}\cdot\left(\Pi_{i=0}^{n-2}K_{1,2^i}\right)\cdot K_{1,2^{n-1}+1-m}\cdot K_{m,2^n-1},\quad k=n, \tag{11}$$

$$K_{m,2^n-1}\cdot K_{\eta,\eta}\cdot\Pi_{j=2}^{n-1}\left[1\cdot K_{1,2^j-1}\right]\cdot 1\cdot K_{1,2^n-1-m}\cdot K_{m,2^n-1},\quad k=2. \tag{12}$$

We consider these cases before the general. Let start with prefixes preceding the product in parentheses. In case $k=1$ we have $m=2^n-1$ and the last 1 of the prefix $K_{2^n-1,2^n-1}\cdot 1$ caused by application of s_1 to the position m in $K_{2^n-1,2^n-1}$. In case $k=2$ instead of s_1 the shift s_2 acts while $\eta=m-2^n+4\in\{1,2\}$. In case $k=n$ obviously the position of the last 1 in the prefix is $m+s_k=m+2^n-1$. This explains the suffix $K_{m,m}$ of the prefix. Note that in all the cases $k=1,2,n$ the considered prefixes have exactly two units with distances $1,3,2^n-1$ respectively between them.

In case $k=1$ the prefix looks like $0^{2^n-2}11$ and therefore the first term $K_{1,2}$ is caused by application of s_1 to calculate a symbol on the position 2^n+1 (which is 1) and shifts s_1,s_2 simultaneously for the symbol 0 on the position 2^n+2.

[9]For convenience we assume supports of strings to start with number 1.

[10]The number of 1(s) depends on $k(m)$, n and is $3+k(n-k+1)$. For $k=1$ and $k=n$ the numbers are equal to $n+3$. For $k=2$ we have $2n+1$ units, etc.

[11]The forms contains single product Π on i or j instead of double product on j,i and are directly deducible from the general form.

Let $\mathcal{A}_k$ is a subset of shifts from $\partial\mathcal{E}_n$ that act (i.e. contribute 1 into the result) at position k. With this term we can say that $\mathcal{A}_{2^n+1} = \{s_1\}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{2^n+2} = \{s_1, s_3\}$. Thus in case $k = 1$ we get a block 1110 which ends at position $2^n + 2$. There is no 1 before the block reachable for shifts from $\mathcal{E}_n$ at further positions $x, x > 2^n + 2$.

In case $k = n$ two first terms $K_{1,1}, K_{1,2}$ of the product (just as above) finish the block 1110 whose the last position is $2^n + m + 2$. This time there is the unit at the position m preceding the block $K_{m,m} \cdot K_{1,1} \cdot K_{1,2}$ but it is not reachable (for shifts from $\mathcal{E}_n$) from positions going after $2^n - 1 + m$. Let us rewrite (11) in form

$$K_{m,2^n-1} \cdot K_{m,m} \cdot \left(\Pi_{i=0}^{n-1} K_{1,2^i}\right) \cdot K_{1,2^n-m} \tag{13}$$

and prove by induction on j that the common remaining part $\Pi_{j=2}^{n-1} K_{j,2^i}$ of products from (10), (13) is the next block of the result of $\mathcal{E}_n^{2^{n+1}-1}$ on $K_{2^n-1,2^n-1}, K_{m,2^n-1}$. For $j = 2$ word W_2 of length 4 that continues the prefix with $K_{1,4}$ is checkable directly. Let a be a position of the first 1 of the just found sub-word 1110 in $\mathcal{E}_n^{2^{n+1}-1}\{K_{m,2^n-1}\}$. It is easy to check that $\mathcal{A}_{a+4} = \{s_3\}$ implying $W_2 = 1W'$. Then $\mathcal{A}_{a+5} = \{s_1, s_3\}$ and we get $W_2 = 10W''$. Further, $\mathcal{A}_{a+6} = \emptyset, \mathcal{A}_{a+7} = \{s_3, s_7\}$. In other words $W_2 = 1000 = K_{1,4}$.

Assume we have proven the statement for $j = h, h < n - 1$, and consider $j = h + 1$. That is we need to prove that $W_{h+1} = W_h \cdot K_{1,2^{h+1}}$. Clearly the last position of W_h is $a + \sum_{j=0}^{h} 2^j = a + 2^{h+1} - 1$. Therefore we should calculate symbols of W_{h+1} at positions from $a + 2^{h+1}$ up to $a + 2^{h+2} - 1$ inclusively. Let start with position $a + 2^{h+1}$. In case $k = 1$ we can write $\mathcal{A}_{a+2^{h+1}} = \{s_i | W_h(a + 2^{h+1} - s_i) = 1\}$ because no 1 occurs before W_h in $\mathcal{E}_n^{2^{n+1}-1}\{K_{n,2^n-1}\}$. In case $k = n$ there is 1 occupying the position $m, m \le 2^{n-1}$, in $\mathcal{E}_n^{2^{n+1}-1}\{K_{m,2^n-1}\}$. However as we showed above it is not reachable by available shifts. Hence the equation $\mathcal{A}_{a+2^{h+1}} = \{s_i | W_h(a + 2^{h+1} - s_i) = 1\}$ fits the case $k = n$ as well.

By assumption of the induction we have that 1 stays on all positions $\{a, a + 2^t | t = \overline{0, h}\}$ only. Hence we get $(a + 2^{h+1} - s_i = a + 2^t) \vee (a + 2^{h+1} - s_i = a)$. The latter does not work because s_i is odd. The condition reduces to $s_i = 2^{h+1} - 2^t$ and satisfies at $t = 0$ only implying $i = h + 1$. Hence $\mathcal{A}_{a+2^{h+1}} = \{s_{h+1}\}$ and $W_{h+1}(a + 2^{h+1}) = 1$.

We state that all other positions from $a+2^{h+1}+1$ up to $a+2^{h+2}-1$ inclusively are filled with zeros. Let g be an integer s.t. $2^{h+1} + 1 \le g \le 2^{h+2} - 1$. We have $\mathcal{A}_{a+g} = \{s_i | W_h(a + g - s_i) = 1\}$. Since the position $a + 2^{h+1}$ is occupied by one we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_i \in \mathcal{A}_{a+g} &\iff \\ (\exists t, 0 \le t \le h+1) \left[a + g - s_i = a + 2^t\right] \vee (a + g - s_i = a) &\iff \\ (\exists t, 0 \le t \le h+1) \left[g = s_i + 2^t\right] \vee (g = s_i) \end{aligned}$$

From the first term of the disjunction (the first disjunct)[12]: since $0 \le t$ and $g, t < 2^{h+2}$ it holds $i \le h + 1$. On the other hand, $g > 2^{h+1}$. Hence $\max\{i, t\} \ge h + 1, \min\{i, t\} < h + 1$. The second disjunct is fulfilled when $i = h + 2$ only due to the restrictions g satisfies. Hence $\mathcal{A}_{a+g} \ne \emptyset \iff g \in \{2^{h+1} + 2^t - 1 | t = 0, \ldots, h + 1\}$. Now, if $g = 2^{h+1} + 2^t - 1, t < h + 1$,

[12]We will use the word "disjunct" for terms of this disjunction and disjunction obtained below in this proof.

obviously $\mathcal{A}_{a+g} = \{s_t, s_{h+1}\}$. If $g = 2^{h+2} - 1$ then $\mathcal{A}_{g+a} = \{s_{h+1}, s_{h+2}\}$ because $s_{h+2} \in \mathcal{E}_n$ yet: $h + 2 \leq n$. The induction on j is over.

Now we need to prove that the remaining suffixes of the results of action of $\mathcal{E}_n^{2^{n+1}-1}$ on $K_{2^n-1,2^n-1}, K_{m,2^n-1}$ are respectively $1 \cdot K_{2^n-1,2^n-1}$ and $K_{1,2^n-m}$ (see (13)).

Since $1 \cdot K_{2^n-1,2^n-1} = K_{1,2^n-1} \cdot 1$ we can apply the consideration from the induction step above (getting case $h = n - 1$). The difference is only that for the last position b of the suffix $K_{1,2^n-1} \cdot 1$ we have $\mathcal{A}_b = \{s_n\}$ because $s_{n+1} \notin \mathcal{E}_n$. This is why the position b is occupied by 1, not 0 as it took place on the induction step above.

Let b be the first position in the conjectured suffix $K_{1,2^n-m}$. It is easy to calculate that $b = 2^n - 1 + m + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 2^i + 1 = m + 2^{n+1} - 1$. The positions of units preceding the unit on the position b in the word (11) are: $m, m + 2^n - 1, m + 2^n - 1 + 2^0, \ldots, m + 2^n - 1 + 2^{n-1}$. So, positions $m, m+2^n-1$ are not reachable from position b by any $s_i \in \mathcal{E}_n$. Other positions before b can be written as $m+2^n-1+2^t, t = \overline{0, n-1}$. The equation $m+2^{n+1}-1-(m+2^n-1+2^t) = 2^n - 2^t \in \mathcal{E}_n$ has only solution $t = 0$. Hence $\mathcal{A}_b = \{s_n\}$ and position b is occupied by 1 indeed.

Now let us find $\mathcal{A}_{b+h}, 0 < h < 2^n - m$ assuming that for any h' such that $0 < h' < h$ the position $b + h'$ is occupied by 0. The list of units on positions before $b + h$ to take into account is[13]

$$m + 2^n - 1 + 2^0, \ldots, m + 2^n - 1 + 2^{n-1}, m + 2^{n+1} - 1,$$

and the equation for $\mathcal{A}_{b'}$ is

$$(h \in \mathcal{E}_n) \vee \exists t \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\} \left[m + 2^{n+1} - 1 + h - (m + 2^n - 1 + 2^t) \in \mathcal{E}_n\right].$$

The first disjunct with $m \geq 1, h < 2^n - m$ can be rewritten as $h \in \{s_1, \ldots, s_{n-1}\}$. The condition $2^n + h - 2^t \in \mathcal{E}_n$ from the second disjunct can be rewritten as $\exists i[h = 2^i + 2^t - 2^n - 1]$. Because $t \leq n - 1$ from $h > 0$ it follows that the unique solution is $i = n$ and $h = 2^t - 1$. Due to the latter equality is in accord with the first disjunct we have that $\mathcal{A}_{b+h} = \{s_t, s_n\}$ if $h = s_t$ and $\mathcal{A}_{b+h} = \emptyset$ otherwise. As $t < n$ we have that $|\mathcal{A}_{b+h}|$ is even and all positions $b + h$ are occupied by zeros.

Thus the formulas (10) and (11) are correct.

In case $k = 2$ we have to prove (12):

$$K_{m,2^n-1} \cdot K_{\eta,\eta} \cdot \Pi_{j=2}^{n-1} \left[1 \cdot K_{1,2^j-1}\right] \cdot 1 \cdot K_{1,2^n-1-m} \cdot K_{m,2^n-1}.$$

It is easy to check that $(2^n - 1 + \eta) - m = s_k = s_2 = 3$. Also directly one can check that the first factor $1 \cdot K_{1,3}$ concatenated to $K_{m,2^n-1} \cdot K_{\eta,\eta}$ is a prefix of $\mathcal{E}_n^{2^{n+1}-1} K_{m,2^n-1}$. The list of positions of units in $K_{m,2^n-1} \cdot K_{\eta,\eta} \cdot 1 \cdot K_{1,3}$ is $m, m + 3, m + 4, m + 5$. In particular, $\mathcal{A}_{m+6} = \{s_1, s_2\}, \mathcal{A}_{m+7} = \{s_2, s_3\}$. We prove that product $\Pi_{j=2}^{n-1} \left[1 \cdot K_{1,2^j-1}\right]$ correctly describes the continuation by induction on $j, 2 \leq j < n$. From the induction hypothesis the list of units for prefix $K_{m,2^n-1} \cdot K_{\eta,\eta} \cdot \Pi_{j=2}^{h} \left[1 \cdot K_{1,2^j-1}\right], 2 \leq h < n - 1$, is

$$m, m + 3, m + 4, m + 5, \ldots, m + 2^h, m + 2^h + 1 \tag{14}$$

[13]Positions $m, m + 2^n - 1$ are not reachable even from b, see above.

whereas the last symbol occupies the position $m+2^h+2^h-1=m+2^{h+1}-1$. We can define $\mathcal{A}_{m+2^{h+1}}$ by the condition

$$s_i \in \mathcal{A}_{m+2^{h+1}} \iff \exists t, 2 \le t \le h [s_i = 2^{h+1} - 2^t \vee s_i = 2^{h+1} - 1 - 2^t]$$

since the condition $(s_i = 2^{h+1}) \vee (s_i = 2^{h+1} - 3)$ can be omitted because $n \ge 4 \implies h+1 \ge 3$. It is clear that the condition $s_i = 2^{h+1} - 2^t$ is impossible when $t \ge 2$. The remaining condition has a unique solution $t = i = h$. Therefore position 2^{h+1} is occupied by 1.

Obviously $s_1 \in \mathcal{A}_{m+2^{h+1}+1}$. If $i > 1$ then as above for $\mathcal{A}_{m+2^{h+1}+1}$ we arrive at condition

$$s_i \in \mathcal{A}_{m+2^{h+1}} \iff \exists t, 2 \le t \le h [s_i = 2^{h+1} + 1 - 2^t \vee s_i = 2^{h+1} - 2^t], i > 2.$$

Both are not solvable because $t > 1$ and $2^{h+1} - 2^t$ is even. Hence position $m + 2^{h+1} + 1$ is occupied by 1 again.

Let us prove that the next $2^{h+1} - 2$ positions are occupied by zeros. Let assume $1 \le q \le 2^{h+1} - 2$ and prove that if for any $q', 0 < q' < q$ position $m + 2^{h+1} + 1 + q'$ is occupied by zero then the same is true for position $m + 2^{h+1} + 1 + q$. We have

$$(15) \quad \begin{cases} s_i \in \mathcal{A}_{m+2^{h+1}+1+q} \iff \big\{(\exists t \in \{2, \dots, h+1\}) \big[s_i = 2^{h+1} + 1 + q - 2^t \quad \vee \\ \qquad\qquad s_i = 2^{h+1} + q - 2^t\big]\big\} \vee \big(s_i = 2^{h+1} + 1 + q\big) \vee \big(s_i = 2^{h+1} + 1 + q - 3\big). \end{cases}$$

There are 4 disjuncts in the condition:
(i) $\exists t, 2 \le t \le h+1 \left[s_i = 2^{h+1} + 1 + q - 2^t\right]$;
(ii) $\exists t, 2 \le t \le h+1 \left[s_i = 2^{h+1} + q - 2^t\right]$;
(iii) $s_i = 2^{h+1} + q + 1$;
(iv) $s_i = 2^{h+1} + q - 2$.
Clearly no two of these conditions are compatible. Let us analyse them one by one.

For (i) on one hand we have $s_i < 2^{h+2} - 4$ due to $t \ge 2$ and given bounds to q. This entails $i \le h+1$. On the other hand, from $q = 2^i + 2^t - (2^{h+1} + 2) > 0$ we have $2^i + 2^t \ge 2^{h+1} + 3$. Hence if $t < h+1$ then $i = h+1$ and hence $q = 2^t - 2$. Thus that is one series of solutions to (i): $i = h+1, q = 2^t - 2, 1 < t < h+1$. Another series arises when we set $t = h+1$. In this case we have $q = 2^i - 2, i = 2, \dots, h+1, t = h+1$.

Similarly[14] for (ii) we get one series $q = 2^t - 1, 1 < t < h+1, i = h+1$, and another one $q = s_i, i = 1, \dots, h, t = h+1$.

For (iii) the unique solution is $q = 2^{h+1} - 2, i = h+2$. Indeed, if $q = s_i - (2^{h+1} + 1)$ then because $q > 0$ it holds $i \ge h+2$. However $i > h+2$ is incompatible with the upper bound $2^{h+1} - 2$ for q.

Similarly from (iv) $i = h+1$ follows and therefore we get unique solution $q = 1$.

From here $\mathcal{A}_{m+2^{h+1}+1+q} \ne \emptyset \iff \bigvee\limits_{f=1,\dots,h+1} (q = 2^f - 1 \vee (q = 2^f - 2)$. Combining solutions to (ii) and (iv) we get $q = 2^f - 1 \implies \mathcal{A}_{m+2^{h+1}+1+q} = \{s_f, s_{h+1}\}$; combining

[14]On one hand we have $s_i < 2^{h+2} - 5$ due to $t \ge 2$ and given bounds to q. This entails $i \le h+1$. On the other hand, from $q = 2^i + 2^t - (2^{h+1} + 1) > 0$ we have $2^i + 2^t \ge 2^{h+1} + 2$. Hence if $t < h+1$ then $i = h+1$ and hence $q = 2^t - 1$. Thus that is one series of solutions to (i): $i = h+1, q = 2^t - 1, 1 < t < h+1$. Another series arises when we set $t = h+1$. In this case we have $q = s_i, i = 1, \dots, h, t = h+1$.

solutions to (i), (iii) we arrive at $q = 2^f - 2 \implies \mathcal{A}_{m+2^{h+1}+1+q} = \{s_f, s_{h+1}\}, t = 2, \dots, h$, and if $f = h + 1$ then $\mathcal{A}_{m+2^{h+1}+1+q} = \{s_f, s_{h+2}\}$. In other words, all $|\mathcal{A}_{m+2^{h+1}+1+q}|$ are even if $q = \overline{1, 2^{h+1} - 2}$. This finishes the induction on j.

It remains only to prove the correctness of the suffix $1 \cdot K_{1,2^n-1-m} \cdot K_{m,2^n-1}$. We rewrite it as $1 \cdot K_{1,2^n-2} \cdot K_{1,2^n-m}$ and first prolong the consideration of correctness the product $\Pi_{j=2}^{n-1}\left[1 \cdot K_{1,2^j-1}\right]$ from (12) given above. The block $1 \cdot K_{1,2^n-2}$ corresponds to step $j = n$ and we need only to explain the difference between the length 2^n of the generic term $1 \cdot K_{1,2^j-1}$ for $j = n$ and the length 2^n-1 of the block $1 \cdot K_{1,2^n-2}$. The conditions (15) are applicable here as well but now $h+1 = n$ and for the position $\bar{q} = 2^n-2$ the equality $\mathcal{A}_{m+2^{h+1}+1+\bar{q}} = \{s_{h+1}, s_{h+2}\}$ looks like $\mathcal{A}_{m+2^n+1+\bar{q}} = \{s_n, s_{n+1}\}$. And because $s_{n+1} \notin \mathcal{E}_n$ we get that in fact $\mathcal{A}_{m+2^n+1+\bar{q}} = \{s_n\}$. The latter enforces 1 on the position $m+2^n+1+\bar{q} = m+2^n+1+2^n-2 = m+2^{n+1}-1$. This position is exactly the first position of the last block $K_{1,2^n-m}$.[15]

To finish the case $k = 2$ we need only to explain why the suffix of the (12) of length 2^n-m-1 consists of zeros. We know now positions of all units preceding the suffix. So we can complete the list (14) as follows:

$$m, m+3, m+4, m+5, \dots, m+2^h, m+2^h+1, \dots, m+2^n, m+2^n+1, m+2^{n+1}-1.$$

Since from a position $m + x, x \geq 2^{n+1}$, by shifts from $\mathcal{E}_n$ are reachable only maybe units on the last three positions $m + 2^n, m + 2^n + 1, m + 2^{n+1} - 1$ the equation for $\mathcal{A}_x$ is

$$s_i \in \mathcal{A}_x \iff (x - s_i = 2^n) \vee (x - s_i = 2^n + 1) \vee (x - s_i = 2^{n+1} - 1).$$

On the other hand, because of $k = 2$, the upper bound for x is $2^{n+1}-1+(2^n-1)-m-1$ which does not exceed $2^{n+1} - 1 + s_2 - 1$. In other words $x \leq 2^{n+1} + 1$.[16] From here the first disjunct in the equation does not work and other two have the only solution for $s_i \in \mathcal{A}_x = \{s_1, s_n\}$ if $x = 1$ and otherwise.

Let us try a general proof. First let us rewrite the formula from the condition in the form

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{E}_n^{2^{n+1}-1}\{K_{m,2^n-1}\} = \\ K_{m,2^n-1} \cdot K_{\eta,\eta} \cdot \Pi_{j=k}^{n-1}\left[W_k \cdot K_{1,2^j-2^{k-1}+1}\right] \cdot W_k \cdot K_{1,2^n-2^{k-1}} \cdot K_{1,2^n-m} \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

where $W_k = \Pi_{i=0}^{k-2} K_{1,2^i}$. Now, $2^n - 1 + \eta$ is the first position from which the unit on position m is reachable due to the definition of k and equality $2^n - 1 + \eta = s_k + m$. This explains the sub-word $K_{\eta,\eta}$ succeeding $K_{m,2^n-1}$. Thus we deal with a word $K_{m,2^n-1} \cdot K_{\eta,\eta}$ having two units only on positions m and $m + s_k$.

Next step is proving the stated structure of the block

$$\Pi_{j=k}^{n-1}\left[W_k \cdot K_{1,2^j-2^{k-1}+1}\right] \cdot W_k \cdot K_{1,2^n-2^{k-1}} \tag{17}$$

[15] Indeed, according to the formula (12) the position of the last 1 is $2^n-1+\eta+2^n-4+1+2^n-1-m+m = 2^n - 1 + m - 2^n + 4 + 2^n - 4 + 1 + 2^n - 1 - m + m = m + 2^{n+1} - 1$.

[16] The number of zeros after the last 1 does depend on one of two possible positions of m for case $k = 2$ but not exceed 2.

by an induction on j with inner induction on i. The part $W_k \cdot K_{1,2^n-2^{k-1}}$ corresponds to the value of generic factor $W_k \cdot K_{1,2^j-2^{k-1}+1}$ at $j = n$ with only difference in the length of $K_{1,2^n-2^{k-1}}$ which must be explained.

Since cases $k = n, k \leq 2$ were considered above we assume that $2 < k < n$. Therefore the base of the external induction consists of a proof of the following structure of the first factor in the external product

$$\Pi_{i=0}^{k-2} K_{1,2^i} \cdot K_{1,2^k-2^{k-1}+1}. \tag{18}$$

The base of the inner induction for (18) states that $K_{1,2^0}$ is a prefix of the word succeeding $K_{m,2^n-1} \cdot K_{\eta,\eta}$. Since $K_{1,2^0} = 1$ this is obvious - this unit is generated by shift s_1 on the last unit of $K_{m,2^n-1} \cdot K_{\eta,\eta}$.

Now we assume $K_{m,2^n-1} \cdot K_{\eta,\eta} \cdot \Pi_{i=0}^{h} K_{1,2^i}, h < k-2$, is a prefix of

$$K_{m,2^n-1} \cdot K_{\eta,\eta} \cdot \Pi_{j=k}^{n-1} \left[W_k \cdot K_{1,2^j-2^{k-1}+1}\right] \cdot W_k \cdot K_{1,2^n-2^{k-1}} \cdot K_{1,2^n-m} \tag{19}$$

and prove the same for $K_{m,2^n-1} \cdot K_{\eta,\eta} \cdot \Pi_{i=0}^{h+1} K_{1,2^i}$. For that we write out positions of units in $K_{m,2^n-1} \cdot K_{\eta,\eta} \cdot \Pi_{i=0}^{h} K_{1,2^i}$:

$$m, m + s_k, m + s_k + 2^0, \ldots, m + s_k + 2^h, \tag{20}$$

wereas all other positions to $m + s_k + 2^h + 2^h - 1$ inclusively are occupied with zeros. Since $h + 1 \leq k - 2$ the next K-block in (19) should be $K_{1,2^{h+1}}$. The distances from position $m + s_k + 2^{h+1}$ to the units in the list (20) are

$$s_k + 2^{h+1}, 2^{h+1}, 2^{h+1} - 2^0, \ldots, 2^{h+1} - 2^h.$$

Since $h > 0$ all numbers in the list are even apart from $s_k + 2^{h+1}, 2^{h+1} - 2^0$. Equation $2^i - 1 = 2^k - 1 + 2^{h+1}$ or $2^i = 2^k + 2^{h+1}$ has a solution $i = h+2$ only if $k = h+1$. But $h < k-2$. Therefore the only term of the above list that belongs to $\mathcal{E}_n$ is $2^{h+1} - 2^0$. Hence $|\mathcal{A}_{m+s_k+2^{h+1}}| = 1$ and this position is occupied by 1. So we prolong the list (20) as

$$m, m + s_k, m + s_k + 2^0, \ldots, m + s_k + 2^h, m + s_k + 2^{h+1} \tag{21}$$

and prove that all positions $q + m + s_k, q = 2^{h+1} + 1, \ldots, 2^{h+2} - 1$ are occupied by zeros. It holds

$$s_i \in \mathcal{A}_{m+s_k+q} \iff \exists t \in \{0, \ldots, h+1\}[s_i = q - 2^t] \vee (s_i = q) \vee (s_i = s_k + q). \tag{22}$$

Any equation $q = s_i + 2^t$ has two solutions when q is in the considered segment. One is defined by $i = h + 1, 0 \leq t \leq h$. Another is defined by $t = h + 1, i = 1, \ldots, h + 1$.

There is one only number of kind s_i in segment $[2^{h+1} + 1, 2^{h+2} - 1]$. It is $2^{h+2} - 1$.

Equation $2^i = 2^k + q$ implies $q = 2^k, i = k + 1$. But $q < 2^{h+2} \leq 2^k$. Therefore the last disjunct in (22) does not work for the positions we consider now.

As a result we have $\mathcal{A}_{m+s_k+q} \neq \emptyset \iff q = 2^{h+1} + s_t, t = 0, \ldots, h + 1$. Also

$$\mathcal{A}_{m+s_k+q} = \begin{cases} \{s_t, s_{h+1}\}, & q = 2^{h+1} + s_t, t < h + 1, \\ \{s_{h+1}, s_{h+2}\}, & q = 2^{h+2} - 1. \end{cases}$$

The induction on i is closed. Now we prove that the K-block $K_{1,2^k-2^{k-1}+1}$ from (18) is correct continuation of the product before it. In other words we need to prove that position[17] $m+s_k+2^{k-1}$ is occupied by 1 and next 2^{k-1} positions are occupied by zeros. The distances from position $m+s_k+2^{k-1}$ to positions from the list (21) where $h=k-3$ are

$$s_k+2^{k-1}, 2^{k-1}, 2^{k-1}-1, 2^{k-1}-2^1, \dots, 2^{k-1}-2^{k-3}, 2^{k-1}-2^{k-2}.$$

Among two odd distances $s_k+2^{k-1}, 2^{k-1}-1$ the first is not element of $\mathcal{E}_n$. The second however is. Therefore the position $m+s_k+2^{k-1}$ is occupied by 1 indeed. For the next 2^{k-1} positions $q+m+s_k, 2^{k-1}<q\le 2^k$, we need slightly change the conditions (22) as follows

$$s_i\in\mathcal{A}_{m+s_k+q} \iff \exists t\in\{0,\dots,k-1\}[s_i=q-2^t]\vee(s_i=q)\vee(s_i=s_k+q) \tag{23}$$

because now we base on the list

$$m, m+s_k, m+s_k+2^0, \dots, m+s_k+2^t, \dots, m+s_k+2^{k-1}$$

of units before positions $q+m+s_k$.

Any equation $q=s_i+2^t$ has two solutions when q is in the segment $[2^{k-1}+1, 2^k-2]$. One is defined by $i=k-1, 1\le t<k-1$. Another is defined by $t=k-1, i=1,\dots,k-2$. There is one solution $i=t=k-1$ for $q=2^k-1$ and one solution $t=0, i=k, q=2^k$ for $q=2^k$. There is one only number of kind s_i in segment $[2^{k-1}+1, 2^k]$. It is 2^k-1. Equation $2^i=2^k+q$ implies $q=2^k, i=k+1$.

As a result we have $\mathcal{A}_{m+s_k+q}\ne\emptyset \iff q=2^{h+1}+s_t, t=0,\dots,h+1$. Also

$$\mathcal{A}_{m+s_k+q}=\begin{cases}\{s_t, s_{k-1}\}, & q=2^{k-1}+2^t-1, 1\le t<k-1,\\ \{s_{k-1}, s_k\}, & q=2^k-1,\\ \{s_k, s_{k+1}\}, & q=2^k.\end{cases}$$

Thus the basis of the induction on j is completed.

The scheme of transition $j\to j+1$ is the same as above: we write out the list of positions of units, and compile the conditions of reachability by shifts from $\mathcal{E}_n$ any of the units from a position we currently consider. Solving the conditions we install what symbol from $\{0,1\}$ occupies the current position.

So, assume the correctness of the prefix $K_{m,2^n-1}\cdot K_{\eta,\eta}\cdot\Pi_{j=k}^h\left[W_k\cdot K_{1,2^j-2^{k-1}+1}\right], h<n-1$, in (16) is proved. From the prefix inspection, the list of positions of units is

$$\begin{cases} m, m+s_k, m+s_k+2^0, \dots, m+s_k+2^{k-1}, \dots,\\ m+s_k+\sum_{j=k}^t 2^j+2^0, \dots m+s_k+\sum_{j=k}^t 2^j+2^{k-1}, \dots\\ m+s_k+\sum_{j=k}^h 2^j+2^0, \dots m+s_k+\sum_{j=k}^h 2^j+2^{k-1}\end{cases}$$

or

$$m, m+s_k, a_0+2^0, \dots, a_0+2^{k-1}, \dots, a_t+2^0, \dots, a_t+2^{k-1}, \dots, a_h+2^0, \dots, a_h+2^{k-1}$$

[17] $h+1=k-2$

where $a_0 = m + s_k$ and $a_t = m + s_k + \sum_{j=k}^{t} 2^j = m + s_k + 2^{t+1} - 2^k = m + s_{t+1}$ where t runs over $k, \dots, h$. So we can rewrite the list as follows

$$\begin{cases} m, m + s_k, \\ m + s_k + 2^0, \dots, m + s_k + 2^u, \dots, m + s_k + 2^{k-1}, \\ \dots \\ m + s_t + 2^0, \dots, m + s_t + 2^u, \dots, m + s_t + 2^{k-1}, \\ \dots \\ m + s_h + 2^0, \dots, m + s_h + 2^u, \dots, m + s_h + 2^{k-1}, \end{cases} \tag{24}$$

where $k \le t \le h$. Also it is easy to see that the last position of the prefix $P_h = K_{m,2^n-1} \cdot K_{\eta,\eta} \cdot \Pi_{j=k}^{h} \left[W_k \cdot K_{1,2^j-2^{k-1}+1}\right]$. It is $m + s_{h+1}$.[18]

Now we check if the block $W_k \cdot K_{1,2^{h+1}-2^{k-1}+1}$ is the correct continuation of P_h. The condition determining $\mathcal{A}_{m+s_{h+1}+2^0}$ is:

$$\begin{aligned} s_i \in \mathcal{A}_{m+s_{h+1}+2^0} \iff & (s_i = s_{h+1} + 2^0) \vee (s_i = s_{h+1} + 2^0 - s_k) \vee \\ & \exists t \in \{k, \dots, h\} \exists u \in \{0, \dots, k-1\} [s_i = s_{h+1} + 2^0 - s_t - 2^u]. \end{aligned}$$

The first disjunct can be cancelled because $s_{h+1} + 1$ is an even integer but s_i is odd.

The second disjunct has no solution when $h \ge k > 2$ because $2^{h+1} - 2^k \ge 2^k > 2$.[19]

For 3rd disjunct we can rewrite equation as $2^i = 2^{h+1} + 2 - (2^t + 2^u)$. If $u = 0$ then $s_{h+1} - s_t$ must be odd but that is impossible due to $h + 1 > t \ge k > 2$. Let $u > 1$. Setting maximal possible values $t := h, k := h, u = h - 1$ we get $2^i = 2^{h+1} + 2 - 2^h - 2^{h-1} \ge 2^{h-1} + 2$. If we set $t := k, u := 1$ we get $2^i \le 2^{h+1} + 2 - (2^k + 2^1) = 2^{h+1} - 2^k \le 2^{h+1} - 8$. In the segment $[2^{h-1} + 2, 2^{h+1} - 8]$ one only power of 2 exists: 2^h. Hence $i = h$ and therefore $2^{h+1} - 2^i = 2^h = 2^t + 2^u - 2$ where $u < k \le t \le h$. From here $t = h, u = 1$. No other solution exists. This implies $|\mathcal{A}_{m+s_{h+1}+2^0}| = 1$ and the position is occupied by 1.

Being still within block W_k from block $W_k \cdot K_{1,2^{h+1}-2^{k-1}+1}$, we assume that a prefix $W_k\big|_{m+s_{h+1}+1}^{m+s_{h+1}+2^{u+1}-1}$ of W_k is proven to be correct. Now we do next step and prolong the proof on positions $m + s_{h+1} + 2^{u+1}, m + s_{h+1} + 2^{u+1} + q, q = 1, \dots, 2^{u+1} - 1$. Notice that to be

[18] It is a sum of position $m + s_h + 2^{k-1}$ of the last 1 in P_h and the number $2^h - 2^{k-1}$ of zeros in $K_{1,2^j-2^{k-1}+1}$.

[19] If $2^i = (2^{h+1} - 2^k) + 2$ then to complete $(2^{h+1} - 2^k)$ to a power of 2 the amount $(2^{h+1} - 2^k)$ must be equal to 2.

within W_k the number $u+1$ must be lesser $k-1$. The list of positions of preceding units is[20]

$$\begin{cases} m, m+s_k, \\ m+s_k+2^0, \dots, m+s_k+2^u, \dots, m+s_k+2^{k-1}, \\ \dots \\ m+s_t+2^0, \dots, m+s_t+2^u, \dots, m+s_t+2^{k-1}, \\ \dots \\ m+s_h+2^0, \dots, m+s_h+2^u, \dots, m+s_h+2^{k-1}, \\ m+s_{h+1}+2^0, \dots, m+s_{h+1}+2^u \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

and therefore the equation for $\mathcal{A}_{m+s_{h+1}+2^{u+1}}$ differs from the previous:

$$\begin{aligned} s_i \in \mathcal{A}_{m+s_{h+1}+2^{u+1}} \iff & (s_i = s_{h+1}+2^{u+1}) \vee (s_i = s_{h+1}+2^{u+1}-s_k) \vee \\ & \exists t \in \{k, \dots, h\} \exists v \in \{0, \dots, k-1\} [s_i = s_{h+1}+2^{u+1}-s_t-2^v] \vee \\ & \exists v \in \{0, \dots, u\} [s_i = 2^{u+1}-2^v]. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Here $0 < u+1 < k-1 < t \le h$ and therefore the first disjunct does not have solutions. The second disjunct has no solution either because s_i is odd but $s_{h+1}+2^{u+1}-s_k$ is even.[21] To avoid the problem with parity and fulfil $s_i = s_{h+1}+2^{u+1}-s_t-2^v$ one need to set $v=0$. So, we can write it as $s_i = (s_{h+1}-s_t)+s_{u+1}$. The only opportunity to satisfy the equation is $t = h = u+1$ (in which case $i = u+2 = h+1$). However that is impossible because $u+1 < h$. The forth disjunct however has the unique solution $s_i = s_{u+1}$. That is why $\mathcal{A}_{m+s_{h+1}+2^{u+1}} = \{s_{u+1}\}$ and the position is occupied by 1.

Now assuming that for all $q', 1 \le q' < q$ where $1 \le q \le 2^{u+1}-1$ a position $m+s_{h+1}+2^{u+1}+q'$ is occupied by 0, we prove that the position $m+s_{h+1}+2^{u+1}+q$ is occupied by 0 as well. The list of unit positions is pretty much similar to (25). The only difference is in the last line where u is replaced with $u+1$, and therefore the equation for $\mathcal{A}_{m+s_{h+1}+2^{u+1}+q}$ is:

$$\begin{aligned} & s_i \in \mathcal{A}_{m+s_{h+1}+2^{u+1}+q} \iff \\ & \begin{cases} (s_i = s_{h+1}+2^{u+1}+q) \vee (s_i = s_{h+1}+2^{u+1}+q-s_k) \vee \\ \exists t \in \{k, \dots, h\} \exists v \in \{0, \dots, k-1\} [s_i = s_{h+1}+2^{u+1}+q-s_t-2^v] \vee \\ \exists v \in \{0, \dots, u+1\} [s_i = 2^{u+1}+q-2^v]. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Since $u+1 < k-1 < h < h+1$ and $1 \le q < 2^{u+1}$ we have $2^{h+1}+2^{u+1} < 2^{h+1}+2^{u+1}+q < 2^{h+1}+2^h$. No power of 2 exists in the segment $[2^{h+1}+2^{h-1}, 2^{h+1}+2^h]$, $h > 2$, and therefore no solution to the first disjunct exists.

The second disjunct has no solutions. Indeed, due to $1 \le u+1 \le k-2$, $1 \le q \le 2^{u+1}-1$, $k \le h$ we have $2 < 2^{u+1}+q \le s_{k-1} < 2^h$. Hence $2^{h+1}-2^{k-1} < 2^{h+1}-(s_k-2^{u+1}-q) < 2^{h+1}$ resulting impossibility for $2^{h+1}-(s_k-2^{u+1}-q)$ to be a power 2^i.

[20] In each line of the list below the last 1 belongs to a K-block following the previous W_k-block; lines correspond to parameter j running $k, \dots, t, \dots, h, h+1$.

[21] $k > 2$.

The third disjunct has solutions $t = h, v = u + 2, q = 2^{u+1} - 1, i = h$ taking into account $u+2 \le k-1$. No other solution exists.[22]. To see that let first prove that $i = h$ has no alternative. Indeed, we can rewrite the matrix of the 3rd disjunct as $2^i = 2^{h+1} + 2^{u+1} + (q + 1) - 2^t - 2^v$ and estimate maximal and minimal values of the sum $g = 2^{u+1} + (q + 1) - 2^t - 2^v$ having $1 \le u + 1 < k - 1,\ 2 \le q + 1 \le 2^{u+1},\ k \le t \le h,\ 0 \le v \le k - 1,\ 3 \le k \le h$. The maximal value of g is $-2^{k-1} - 1$ whereas the minimal value is $-2^h - 2^{k-1} + 4$. That yields $2^{h-1} + 4 \le 2^h - 2^{k-1} + 4 \le 2^{h+1} + g \le 2^{h+1} - 2^{k-1} - 1$. So one only power of 2 exists in this interval and it is 2^h Hence $i = h$. To get that t must be equal to h and we arrive at the equality $2^v = 2^{u+1} + q + 1$. From here $q = s_{u+1}, v = u + 2$. And because of $v \le k - 1$ the said is true when $u + 1 \le k - 2$.

The forth disjunct has two series of solutions. One is $q = s_v, i = u + 1, v = 1, \dots, u + 1$. Another one is $v = u + 1, s_i = q$ where q runs over list $1, \dots, s_u$. The case $v = u + 1, s_i = q = s_{u+1}$ coincides with the last solution in the previous series.[23] Since $s_i \le s_{u+1}$ and all such s_i are included into the solution, the consideration is complete.

The summary is that $\mathcal{A}_{m+s_{h+1}+2^{u+1}+q} = \emptyset$ if $q \notin \mathcal{E}_n$ and defined as follows

$$\mathcal{A}_{m+s_{h+1}+2^{u+1}+q} = \begin{cases} \{s_i, s_{u+1}\}, & q = s_1, \dots, s_u, \\ \{s_{u+1}, s_h\}, & q = s_{u+1}, \end{cases}$$

otherwise. Thus all positions $m + s_{h+1} + 2^{u+1} + q, q = s_1, \dots, s_{u+1}$ are occupied by zeros. This conclusion finishes the induction on u and W_k is passed.

Let us consider the first position after the considered block W_k. It is $m + s_{h+1} + 2^{k-1}$. The equation for $\mathcal{A}_{m+s_{h+1}+2^{k-1}}$ is similar to (26)

$$\begin{aligned} s_i \in \mathcal{A}_{m+s_{h+1}+2^{k-1}} \iff (s_i = s_{h+1} + 2^{k-1}) \vee (s_i = s_{h+1} + 2^{k-1} - s_k) \vee \\ \exists t \in \{k, \dots, h\} \exists v \in \{0, \dots, k-1\} [s_i = s_{h+1} + 2^{k-1} - s_t - 2^v] \vee \\ \exists v \in \{0, \dots, k-2\} [s_i = 2^{k-1} - 2^v]. \end{aligned}$$

Due to $2^{h+1} + 2^{k-1}$ is not a power of 2 the first disjunct fails. The RHS of the second is even whereas the LHS must be odd. To make the RHS in the third disjunct odd we must set $v = 0$. So, i should satisfy the inequalities $2^h + 2^{k-1} \le 2^i \le 2^{h+1} - 2^{k-1}$. Clearly that is impossible. Finally in the 4th disjunct we must first set $v = 0$. hence the unique solution is $s_i = s_{k-1}$.

Thus the position is occupied by 1 and according to the structure $K_{1,2^{h+1}-2^{k-1}+1}$ of the subword we are considering now, we need to prove that zeros stay on next $2^{h+1} - 2^{k-1}$ positions.

[22]The case $q = s_v, t = u + 1, s_i = s_{h+1}$ is not possible because $t \ge k > u + 1$.

[23]The case $v = 0$ is impossible because $q < 2^{u+1}$.

Let $1 \le q \le 2^{h+1} - 2^{k-1}$. The conditions for $\mathcal{A}_{m+s_{h+1}+2^{k-1}+q}$ are similar to (27):

$$s_i \in \mathcal{A}_{m+s_{h+1}+2^{k-1}+q} \iff$$
$$\begin{cases} (s_i = s_{h+1} + 2^{k-1} + q) \vee (s_i = s_{h+1} + 2^{k-1} + q - s_k) \vee \\ \exists t \in \{k, \dots, h\} \exists v \in \{0, \dots, k-1\} [s_i = s_{h+1} + 2^{k-1} + q - s_t - 2^v] \vee \\ \exists v \in \{0, \dots, k-1\} [s_i = 2^{k-1} + q - 2^v]. \end{cases}$$

The only way to satisfy $s_i = s_{h+1} + x, x > 0$, is to put $x = 2^{h+1}$. Then $s_i = s_{h+2}$ and $q = 2^{h+1} - 2^{k-1}$.

The second disjunct can be rewritten as $s_i = s_{h+1} + q - s_{k-1}$. Since $2 - 2^{k-1} \le q - s_{k-1} \le 2^{h+1} - s_k$ the only way to get a number of sort s_i for some i from $s_{h+1} + q - s_{k-1}$ is to set $q = s_{k-1}$ resulting $s_i = s_{h+1}$.

Represent the 3rd disjunct in form $s_i = (s_{h+1} - s_t) + (2^{k-1} - 2^v) + q$. The restrictions $0 \le v \le k-1,\ k \le t \le h$ imply $s_h \le (s_{h+1} - s_t) \le s_{h+1} - s_k,\ 0 \le (2^{k-1} - 2^v) \le 2^{k-1} - 1$; and we have $1 \le q \le 2^{h+1} - 2^{k-1}$. From here we find the upper and low bonds to s_i:

$$s_h + 0 + 1 \le s_i \le s_{h+1} - s_k + s_{k-1} + 2^{h+1} - 2^{k-1}$$
$$s_h < s_i \le s_{h+2} - 2^k$$

and due to $k \le h$ we obtain that $s_{h+1} < s_{h+2} - 2^k$ and the solution to s_i is fixed: $s_i = s_{h+1}$. Therefore for possible values of q we get the form $q = s_t + 2^v - 2^{k-1},\ t \in \{k, \dots, h\},\ v \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$. This yields two-parametric series of solutions

$$s_i = s_{h+1}, \quad q = s_t + 2^v - 2^{k-1},\ t \in \{k, \dots, h\},\ v \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}. \tag{28}$$

It is easy to see that the solutions to q are within segment $[4, s_h]$ (due to $k > 2$) and thereby satisfy the restrictions for q.

The solutions to the forth disjunct[24] can be described as two-parametric family (with parameters i, v). Indeed, due to $2^{k-1} - 2^v \ge 0$ the equation $s_i = (2^{k-1} - 2^v) + q$ with restrictions for v, i, and q allows us to list L a series of possible values of s_i. First from $s_i = (2^{k-1} - 2^v) + q$ we derive $q \le s_i \le q + s_{k-1}$ and with $1 \le q \le 2^{h+1} - 2^{k-1}$ we can write $1 \le s_i \le s_{h+1}$. However in the equation $q = s_i + 2^v - 2^{k-1}$ the sum $s_i + 2^v$ must exceed 2^{k-1}. Also when $i = h+1$ due to upper limit for q it should hold that $v = 0$. This is why we represent solutions by two series

$$\begin{cases} q = 2^{h+1} - 2^{k-1},\ s_i = s_{h+1}; \\ q = s_t + 2^v - 2^{k-1},\ s_i = s_t, \quad t \in \{k, \dots, h\},\ v \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}, \end{cases} \tag{29}$$

where in the second line i and v take their possible values independently. And one more[25]

$$q = s_t + 2^v - 2^{k-1},\ s_i = s_t,\ t \in \{1, \dots, k-1\},\ v \in \{1, \dots, k-1\},$$

[24]The 4th disjunct could be included into the 3rd by extending the diapason for t to $[k, h+1]$.

[25]Notice that 1 is the minimal value for v here because in case $v = 0$ for any value of $i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$ the value of q is not positive.

where i, v are chosen to satisfy the condition $s_i + 2^v > 2^{k-1}$. The latter condition can be rewritten as $\max\{i, v\} \geq k-1$. Hence we get two sub-series of solutions. One is $q = s_{k-1} + 2^v - 2^{k-1} = s_v,\ v = 1, \dots k-1$, whereas the value of s_i is fixed: $s_i = s_{k-1}$. Another is $q = s_t + 2^{k-1} - 2^{k-1} = s_t,\ s_i = s_t,\ t = 1, \dots, k-1$. The series have a common pair $q = s_i = s_{k-1}$. Therefore we exclude repetition as follows

$$\begin{cases} q = s_v,\ s_i = s_{k-1}, & v = 1, \dots, k-2; \\ q = s_i,\ s_i = s_t & t = 1, \dots, k-2; \\ q = s_i = s_{k-1}. \end{cases} \tag{30}$$

No other solutions exist.[26]

Now we show that for all q s.t. $\mathcal{A}_{m+s_{h+1}+2^{k-1}+q} \neq \emptyset$ the number of shifts that solve the equation for $\mathcal{A}_{m+s_{h+1}+2^{k-1}+q}$ is even.

Comparing (28) to the second line of (29) we find out that solutions for q in both are the same. Therefore for $q = s_t + 2^v - 2^{k-1},\ t = k, \dots, h,\ v = 0, \dots, k-1$, set $\mathcal{A}_{m+s_{h+1}+2^{k-1}+q}$ includes two shifts s_t, s_{h+1}.

Two first lines from (30) imply $\mathcal{A}_{m+s_{h+1}+2^{k-1}+s_v} = \{s_v, s_{k-1}\}, v = 1, \dots, k-2$.

The third line from (30) with the solution $q = s_{k-1},\ s_i = s_{h+1}$ for the second disjunct imply $\mathcal{A}_{m+s_{h+1}+2^{k-1}+s_{k-1}} = \{s_{k-1}, s_{h+1}\}$.

Remaining are the solutions to the first disjunct: $q = s_{h+1} - s_{k-1},\ s_i = s_{h+2}$ and the solution $q = 2^{h+1} - 2^{k-1},\ s_i = s_{h+1}$ from the 1st line of (29). Hence $\mathcal{A}_{m+s_{h+1}+2_{h+1}} = \{s_{h+1}, s_{h+2}\}$. Since $h+1 \leq n-1$ by the assumption of disjunction on j it is true that $s_{h+1}+2_{h+1} = s_{h+2} \in \mathcal{E}_n$.

Thus we finished the induction on j and the prefix $K_{m,2^n-1} \cdot K_{\eta,\eta} \cdot \Pi_{j=k}^{n-1} \left[W_k \cdot K_{1,2^j-2^{k-1}+1}\right]$ of $\mathcal{E}_n^{2^{n+1}-1}\{K_{m,2^n-1}\}$ is proved.

Now we prove the next block $W_k \cdot K_{1,2^n-2^{k-1}}$. There is one only difference from the previous blocks $W_k \cdot K_{1,2^j-2^{k-1}+1}$. It is the length of the block $K_{1,2^n-2^{k-1}}$ which is shorter by 1 than in case it was obtained from $W_k \cdot K_{1,2^j-2^{k-1}+1}$ by setting $j = n$. This is enforced by the fact that when $h+1 = n$ the previous consideration fails at the very last position $m + s_{h+1} + 2_{h+1}$ of zero because when $h+1 = n$ the shift s_{h+2} does not belong to $\mathcal{E}_n$ and therefore $\mathcal{A}_{m+s_{h+1}+2_{h+1}}$ consists of one element s_{h+1} only. Simultaneously we see that the position following the block $W_k \cdot K_{1,2^n-2^{k-1}}$ is occupied by 1. It remains only to prove that zeros stay on the remaining $2^n - m - 1$ positions.

[26]Notice the similarity between the forms of solutions for the last two disjuncts.

The list of positions of units preceding the suffix $[K_{1,2^n-m}]\,\big|_2^{2^n-m}$ is[27]

$$\begin{cases} m, m+s_k, \\ m+s_k+2^0, \ldots, m+s_k+2^u, \ldots, m+s_k+2^{k-1}, \\ \ldots \\ m+s_t+2^0, \ldots, m+s_t+2^u, \ldots, m+s_t+2^{k-1}, \\ \ldots \\ m+s_n+2^0, \ldots, m+s_n+2^u, \ldots, m+s_n+2^{k-1}, \\ m+s_{n+1}. \end{cases}$$

As above we compile an equation for $\mathcal{A}_{m+s_{n+1}+q}$ where $1 \le q \le 2^n - m - 1$:

$$s_i \in \mathcal{A}_{m+s_{n+1}+q} \iff$$
$$\begin{cases} (s_i = s_{n+1} + q) \vee (s_i = s_{n+1} + q - s_k) \vee \\ \exists t \in \{k, \ldots, n\} \exists v \in \{0, \ldots, k-1\} [s_i = s_{n+1} + q - s_t - 2^v] \vee \\ [s_i = q]. \end{cases}$$

As we know, $2^n - m \le s_k$. Therefore $q \le 2^n - m - 1 < s_k$.

The first two disjuncts have no solution for s_i to be in $\mathcal{E}_n$ because of $q > 0, s_n > s_k, s_{n+1} = s_n + 2^n > 2 \cdot s_n$.

For the 3rd condition we notice that if $v = 0$ then $s_{n+1} - s_t + q - 2^v = s_n + 2^n - (2^t - 1 - q + 2^0) = s_n + 2^n - (2^t - q)$. And since $q > 0, t \le n$ we have $2^t - q < 2^n$. Therefore $s_i = s_n + 2^n - (2^t - q) > s_n$ causing $s_i \notin \mathcal{E}_n$. Rewrite the third condition as $s_i = (s_{n+1} - 2^t) + (q - s_v)$. One series of solutions can be obtained for $t = n$:

$$q = s_v,\ v = 1, \ldots, k-1,\ s_i = s_n.$$

Let us show that no other solutions exist. Assume $t < n$. In this case $s_{n+1} - s_t + q - 2^v > s_n$ because $k \le n, t \le n-1$ and $s_t + 2^v - q < 2^{n-1} + 2^{k-1} - q < 2^n$ but $s_{n+1} = s_n + 2^n$. Thus we can assume $t = n,\ v \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$ and $s_i = s_n + (q - s_v)$. Clearly $q > s_v$ implies $s_i \notin \mathcal{E}_n$. On the other hand $k \le n, q > 0$ entails $q - s_v > -2^{n-1}$. This cancels opportunity for s_i to be lesser s_n.

The 4th disjunct has solutions $q = s_t,\ s_i = s_t,\ t = 1, \ldots, k-1$, where the upper limit follows from the condition $q < s_k$.

Thus $\mathcal{A}_{m+s_{n+1}+q}$ consists of two shifts s_t and s_n when $q = s_t,\ t \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$, otherwise is empty.

□

[27]Notice the absence of term 2^0 in the last line. Also $s_{n+1} = s_n + 2^n$.

ADDENDUM 2: A PROOF OF THE THEOREM 6

Theorem 6. *Let $C = (x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ is a position collection, B is its spectrum kernel, and $a \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Position collection $aC = (ax_1, \ldots, ax_r)$ has spectrum kernel $\{b\eta(a,b)|b \in B\}$.*

Proof. If $a = 1$ nothing is to prove. Further, if the spectrum kernel for C is $\{1\}$, the theorem states that the same is true for aC since $\eta(a,1) = 1$. And that statement is true because any period $h^k, h \in \{0,1\}$, for C obviously generates a period h^{ka} for aC.[28] And yet, both of these periods evidence for the proper period h.

Let $a > 1, 1 \notin B$. Assume F is a semi-infinite word s.t. $F = F\mid_0^\infty$ satisfying the recursion set by aC. Introduce classes of equivalence $K_i, i = 0, \ldots, a-1$, by modulo a as $K_i = \{x \in \mathbb{N} | x \equiv i \pmod a\}$.[29] Then, semi-infinite word F_i defined as $F_i(n) = F(an+i)$ satisfies recursion C for each i. And vice versa, from any a periods (not necessarily different) of C-recursion $\pi_0, \ldots, \pi_{a-1}$ it is easy to construct a period of aC-recursion. For that on each class K_i we construct a periodic word s.t. $F(an+i) = \pi_i(\mathrm{rem}(n, l_i))$ where l_i is the length of π_i. Clearly the length of the period of F does not exceed $a \cdot \mathrm{lcm}(l_0, \ldots, l_{a-1})$. This means that for each $b \in B$ it is possible to construct a period of size ab for the collection aC of shifts. Although it can be not a proper period.

We call i-th *component* of $F\mid_0^{ab}$ string $\mathfrak{F}_i = \Pi_{n=0}^{b-1} F(an+i)$ where i runs over set $\{0, \ldots, a-1\}$. Also we write $F = \mathfrak{F}_0 * \mathfrak{F}_1 * \cdots * \mathfrak{F}_{a-1}$.

Now we show how to build for aC a period whose length is $\eta(a,b)b$. Notice that any cyclic permutation of a period is also a period of the same length.

Case $a = 2$ and π is a C-period of length $b, b > 1$, where $b \in B$ is an odd integer:
we have $\eta(2,b) = 1$ and $\eta(2,b)b = b$, and therefore though

$$F\mid_0^{2b} = \pi(0) \cdot \pi(0) \ldots \pi(b-1) \cdot \pi(b-1),$$

we must show that a cyclic shift of $\mathfrak{F}_1$ $(= \Pi_{n=0}^{b-1} F\mid_0^{2b} (2n+1))$ turns $F\mid_0^{2b}$ into a square of a string w of length b. Form here it follows that b is the length of a period for the collection $2C$.

Since ww should be equal to $\mathfrak{F}_0 * \sigma^x(\mathfrak{F}_1)$ it must hold $x = \lfloor \frac{b}{2} \rfloor$ because just in this case $[\mathfrak{F}_0 * \sigma^x(\mathfrak{F}_1)](b) = [\mathfrak{F}_0 * \sigma^x(\mathfrak{F}_1)](0)$. Hence we have expression

$$\pi(0) \cdot \pi(x+1) \cdot \pi(1) \cdot \pi(x+2) \ldots \pi(b-1) \cdot \pi(x) \cdot \pi(0) \cdot \pi(x+1) \cdot \pi(1) \ldots \pi(b-1) \cdot \pi(x)$$

for ww, and it remains to define $w = \pi(0) \cdot \pi(x+1) \cdot \pi(1) \cdot \pi(x+2) \ldots \pi(b-1) \cdot \pi(x)$.

To illustrate the idea of the construction above with more details we consider *more general case:* $a, b > 1, \gcd(a,b) = 1$. From $\gcd(a,b) = 1$ it follows $\eta(a,b) = 1$. We must show that it is possible to choose integers $x_1, \ldots, x_{a-1}$ so that

$$\mathfrak{F}_0 * \sigma^{x_1}(\mathfrak{F}_1) * \cdots * \sigma^{x_{a-1}}(\mathfrak{F}_{a-1}) = w^a$$

for some string $w, |w| = b$. To do that we use $a-1$ conditions

$$[\mathfrak{F}_0 * \sigma^{x_1}(\mathfrak{F}_1) * \cdots * \sigma^{x_{a-1}}(\mathfrak{F}_{a-1})](ib) = [\mathfrak{F}_0](0), i = \overline{1, a-1}. \tag{31}$$

[28] Recall that in contrast to our usage of term "period", when we say "proper period" we mean a period π s.t. no other period μ exists s.t. $\pi = \mu^m, m > 1$.

[29] Remember: $\mathbb{N} = \{0\} \cup \mathbb{Z}^+$.

Let $k(i)$ is defined by condition that the position ib belongs to $\mathfrak{F}_{k(i)}$ i.e. $k(i) = \mathrm{rem}(bi, a)$. Assume that for some i, i' we have $k(i) = k(i')$ or in other words $ib \equiv i'b \,(\mathrm{mod}\ a)$. Since $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ that means that $a \mid (i - i')$. The latter contradicts to $0 \leq i, i' < a$. Thus k is a bijection on $\{1, \ldots, a-1\}$ and conditions (31) are compatible. Now we define $x_i = \lfloor \frac{\kappa(i)b}{a} \rfloor, i = \overline{0, b-1}$, where $\kappa = k^{-1}$.[30]

Let us prove that for chosen $x_1, \ldots x_{a-1}$ and any $i \in \{0, \ldots, a-1\}$ we have

$$[\mathfrak{F}_0 * \sigma^{x_1}(\mathfrak{F}_1) * \cdots * \sigma^{x_{a-1}}(\mathfrak{F}_{a-1})] \mid_{ib}^{(i+1)b-1} = [\mathfrak{F}_0 * \sigma^{x_1}(\mathfrak{F}_1) * \cdots * \sigma^{x_{a-1}}(\mathfrak{F}_{a-1})]_0^{b-1}.$$

For that we calculate $[\mathfrak{F}_0 * \sigma^{x_1}(\mathfrak{F}_1) * \cdots * \sigma^{x_{a-1}}(\mathfrak{F}_{a-1})]_{ib}^{(i+1)b-1}(m), ib \leq m < (i+1)b$.

The number of a-block in $F \mid_0^{ab-1}$ including the position $ib + m$ is $d = \lfloor \frac{ib+m}{a} \rfloor$. This means that $F \mid_0^{ab-1} \ (ib + m) = \pi(d)$. On the other hand, position $ib + m$ belongs to component $\mathfrak{F}_r$ where $r = \mathrm{rem}(ib + m, a)$. However in $\mathfrak{F}_0 * \sigma^{x_1}(\mathfrak{F}_1) * \cdots * \sigma^{x_{a-1}}(\mathfrak{F}_{a-1})$ components $\mathfrak{F}_q$ are cyclically shifted to right on x_q positions. And yet, shift x_r is defined by $j = \kappa(r)$.[31] Since jb and $ib + m$ belongs to the same component[32] the relation $jb \equiv ib + m \,(\mathrm{mod}\ a)$ holds. In other word $\exists s[jb = ib + m + sa]$.

Thus, the position d in π becomes shifted left on $\lfloor \frac{ib+m+sa}{a} \rfloor$ positions and the actual symbol staying on position $ib+m$ in $[\mathfrak{F}_0 * \sigma^{x_1}(\mathfrak{F}_1) * \cdots * \sigma^{x_{a-1}}(\mathfrak{F}_{a-1})]_{ib}^{(i+1)b-1}(m)$ is $\pi\left(d - \lfloor \frac{ib+m+sa}{a} \rfloor\right) = \pi\left(\lfloor \frac{ib+m}{a} \rfloor - \lfloor \frac{ib+m+sa}{a} \rfloor\right) = \pi(\mathrm{rem}(-s, b))$.

It remains to show that $\mathrm{rem}(-s, b)$ does not depend on i. But we have (see above) $jb = ib + m + sa$ which means that $b \mid (m + sa)$. Since j is defined uniquely there should exist one only s for each $m \in \{0, \ldots, b-1\}$. However this formally does not cancel opportunity that s depends on i, j too. On the other hand, if s, s' obeys $b \mid (m + sa)$ and $b \mid (m + s'a)$ then $b \mid (s - s')$. And $s, s' < b$ holds because $sa, s'a < ab$ due to the fact that we operate with the segment of F of length ab exactly. Hence we can find s only on the basis of a, b, m does not matter what value has i.

The general case. We can assume $a, b, \eta(a, b) = \eta > 1$. Let

$$F = \pi(0) \ldots \pi(0)\pi(1) \ldots \pi(1) \ldots \pi(b-1) \ldots \pi(b-1) \tag{32}$$

where each group of symbols $\pi(i) \ldots \pi(i)$ has length a.

Let us denote by μ the integer $\frac{a}{\eta(a,b)}$. We must show that it is possible to choose integers $x_1, \ldots, x_{a-1}$ so that

$$\hat{F} = \mathfrak{F}_0 * \sigma^{x_1}(\mathfrak{F}_1) * \cdots * \sigma^{x_{a-1}}(\mathfrak{F}_{a-1}) = w^{\mu} \tag{33}$$

[30] By the definition of $F \mid_0^{ab-1} = \mathfrak{F}_0 * \mathfrak{F}_1 * \cdots * \mathfrak{F}_{a-1}$ we have $F(k(i)) = \pi(\lfloor \frac{ib}{a} \rfloor)$. Therefore (to switch on intuition: assume that all letters in π are different) $x_{k(i)} = \lfloor \frac{ib}{a} \rfloor, i \in \{0, \ldots, a-1\}$. And yet we need to get rid of this assumption.

[31] Because the shift x_r is defined by a position jb which belongs to $\mathfrak{F}_r$.

[32] $\mathfrak{F}_r$

for some string $w, |w| = \eta b$. To do that we use some conditions from ab of them

$$\hat{F}(j) = \hat{F}(i\eta b + j), 0 = 1, \dots, \mu - 1, j = 0, \dots \eta b - 1 \tag{34}$$

and then check the other. First we choose a equations

$$\hat{F}(0) = \hat{F}(i\eta b), i = 0, \dots, \mu - 1 \tag{35}$$

and define mapping

$$k : \{0, 1, \dots, \mu - 1\} \to \{0, \eta \dots, (\mu - 1)\eta\}$$

as

$$k(i) = \mathrm{rem}(i\eta b, a). \tag{36}$$

Indeed, $\eta \mid k(i)$ for any $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \mu - 1\}$ because $\eta \mid a$. Also k is a bijection. To see the latter assume that $k(i) = k(i')$ for some $i, i' \in \{0, \dots, \mu - 1\}$. From (36) we deduce $i\eta b \equiv i'\eta b \,(\mathrm{mod}\ a)$ or $a \mid (i - i')\eta b$. Since $a = \eta\mu$ and $\gcd(\mu, b) = 1$ it follows from here that $\mu \mid (i - i')$. However $|i - i'| < \mu$. Hence $i = i'$. It remains to notice that $|\{0, 1, \dots, \mu - 1\}| = |\{0, \eta \dots, (\mu - 1)\eta\}|$.

Now we define

$$x_{k(i)} = \left\lfloor \frac{i\eta(a, b)b}{a} \right\rfloor, i = 0, \dots, \mu - 1. \tag{37}$$

In this way we have defined μ shifts from a of them $x_0, \dots, x_{a-1}$ in (33). To define others, for each $j \in \{0, \dots, a - 1\}$ we set

$$x_j = x_{\bar{j}}, \text{ where } j \in \{0, \dots, a - 1\}, \bar{j} = \left\lfloor \frac{j}{\eta} \right\rfloor \eta = j - \mathrm{rem}(j, \eta). \tag{38}$$

The definition is correct because $\bar{j} \in \{0, \eta, \dots, (\mu - 1)\eta\}$ and thereby $\bar{j}$ is a value of function k; so we can apply (37) using k^{-1} as

$$x_j = \left\lfloor \frac{k^{-1}(\bar{j})\eta b}{a} \right\rfloor, j = 0, \dots, a - 1. \tag{39}$$

Thus $\hat{F}$ is completely defined and we should show that $\hat{F}(i\eta b + j), 0 \le j < \eta b$, does not depend on i. The position $i\eta b + j$ belongs to component $\mathfrak{F}_r$ where $r = \mathrm{rem}(i\eta b + j, a)$. Therefore $F(i\eta b + j) = \pi(\lfloor \frac{i\eta b + j}{a} \rfloor)$ (see (32)).

Let us for beginning assume that $j = \bar{j}$, i.e $\eta \mid j$. In this case $r \in \{0, \eta, \dots, \eta(\mu - 1)\}$, $r = \bar{r}$, $k^{-1}(\bar{r})$ is defined and equal to $k^{-1}(r)$.

In $\hat{F}$ the component $\mathfrak{F}_r$ is cyclically shifted right by x_r positions and therefore $\hat{F}(i\eta b + j) = \pi(\lfloor \frac{i\eta b + j}{a} \rfloor - x_r)$ where $x_r = \left\lfloor \frac{k^{-1}(r)\eta b}{a} \right\rfloor$. For some i' we can write $k^{-1}(r)\eta b = i'\eta b$. An integer $g = g(j, b, a)$ exists s.t. $k^{-1}(i\eta b + j) \equiv (i + g)\eta b \,(\mathrm{mod}\ a)$. Indeed, within equivalence by modulo a the amount can be rewritten as $i\eta b + g\eta b$ where $j \equiv g\eta b \,(\mathrm{mod}\ a)$. When $j = \eta j'$ the latter equation can be rewritten as $j' \equiv gb \,(\mathrm{mod}\ \mu)$ which has a solution g because j could be first

replaced with $\mathrm{rem}(j,a)$ which yields for j' the bounds $0 \le j' < \mu$ and because $\gcd(b,\mu) = 1$.[33] On the other hand, positions $i\eta b + j, k^{-1}(r)\eta b$ belong to the same component $\mathfrak{F}_r$. Therefore $i\eta b + j - (i+g)\eta b = sa$ for some integer s. In other words we have $sa = j - g\eta b$. The latter entails

$$\left\lfloor \frac{i\eta b + j}{a} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{k^{-1}(r)\eta b}{a} \right\rfloor = \frac{j - g\eta b}{a}.$$

This means that the shift does not depend on i.[34]

Further we need to expand the proof on the case when $\eta \nmid j$. It is possible to partition $\hat{F}$ into sub-strings of length η because $a = \eta\mu$. By the same reason the partition consists of partitions of all a-blocks. The latter means that j belongs to an a-block iff the whole η-block $(\bar{j}, \bar{j}+1, \ldots, \bar{j}+\eta-1)$ belongs to the a-block. By definition (39) and setting F we have $x_j = x_{j'}$ if $\bar{j} = \bar{j}'$ and $F(j) = F(j')$. The latter implies $\hat{F}(j) = \hat{F}(j')$. So, if $\hat{F}(i\eta b + \bar{j})$ does not depend on i, $\hat{F}(i\eta b + j)$ does not depend on i as well.

It remains to prove that aC has no period not divisible by some $b'\eta(a,b'), b' \in B$. Assume there exists a minimal period of length q for collection aC in the sense that q is not divisible by the length of more short period for aC. Then there exists a period of length $\frac{\mathrm{lcm}(q,a)}{a}$ for collection C. Since $\mathrm{lcm}(q,a) \le qa$ we have $\frac{\mathrm{lcm}(q,a)}{a} \le q$. And since any period length for collection C is divisible by some $b \in B$ from $\frac{\mathrm{lcm}(q,a)}{a} \mid q$ it follows that $b \mid q$.

We need to deduce that $\frac{q}{\gcd(q,a)}$ is a period for C. (Here $\gcd(q,a)$ plays a role of $\eta(a,b)$.) For that show that $\frac{a}{\gcd(a,q)}$ and $\gcd(a,q)$ relatively prime.

When $\gcd(a,q) > 1$, either $\frac{a}{\gcd(a,q)}$ or $\frac{q}{\gcd(a,q)}$ are relatively prime with $\gcd(a,q)$ but only one of them. If the first then $\gcd(a,q)$ is in fact $\eta(a,b)$ and $q = \eta(a,b)b$ where $b = \frac{q}{\gcd(a,q)}$. If the second, then this b is relatively prime with a and as it was shown above b is also a period length for aC. Hence, q is not a minimal (also in the sense that is not divisible by other period lengths).

If $\gcd(a,q) = 1$ then q is also a period length for C.

□

[33] Since $\gcd(b,\mu) = 1$ there are integers h, q s.t. $1 = qb + h\mu$. From here $j' = j'qb + j'h\mu$. From here when $0 \le j' < \mu$ we deduce $j' = j'qb \pmod{\mu}$. So $g = \mathrm{rem}(qj', \mu)$.
Example: $a = 15, b = 3, \eta = 3, \mu = 5$. In this case we have:

$$j = 1\cdot\eta \implies k^{-1}(i\eta b + j) \equiv (i+2)\eta b \pmod{a}$$
$$j = 2\cdot\eta \implies k^{-1}(i\eta b + j) \equiv (i+4)\eta b \pmod{a}.$$

[34] In the example (see the previous footnote) we had $g = 2$ for $j = \eta$ and $g = 4$ for $j = 2\eta$. Respectively the fraction $\frac{j - g\eta b}{a}$ is equal to $\frac{3-2\cdot 9}{15} = -1$ and $\frac{6-4\cdot 9}{15} = -2$